

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XII.—No. 45.

JANUARY, 1936.

ON BLICKLING HOMILY XIII: *THE ASSUMPTION OF THE VIRGIN*

THE SOURCE AND THE MISSING PASSAGES

BY RUDOLPH WILLARD

ONE of the most popular and widespread of the New Testament apocryphal narratives is the circumstantial account of the death and bodily assumption into heaven of the Virgin Mary. This story originated about the fifth century, in Egypt perhaps (it certainly was elaborated there),¹ and spread throughout Christendom, leaving an indelible impression on the literature, art, and liturgy of the Western world.

Of this apocryphon there have been available hitherto in Latin two different redactions, which are known, from Tischendorf's designation of them, as the A-text,² attributed to Joseph of Arimathæa, but which, in spite of Tischendorf's preference for it, is an inferior and relatively late account,³ and the B-text, attributed to Melito, Bishop of Sardis. This latter might be called the standard and orthodox Latin form of this apocryphon; upon it are based

¹ Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford, 1924, p. 194. André Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia, Studi e Testi*, lix, Città del Vaticano, 1933, p. 323.

² Constantinus Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphas . . . item Mariæ Dormitio*, Leipzig, 1866, pp. xxxiv-xlvi, and 113-123. James gives an analysis of it, *Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 216-218. I shall refer to it as *Transitus A*.

³ James, *op. cit.*, pp. 194 and 216; Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, p. 323.

the later and popular accounts, such as that in the *Aurea Legenda*, and from it most of the Western vernacular accounts are derived. It is the best known and most frequently printed story of the Assumption of the Virgin.¹

Both of these recensions are relatively late. The existence of an earlier account, the basis of these later redactions, was evident from Gregory of Tour's summary of the *Assumption*, which varies in detail from the standard and, as Wilmart terms it, "catholic," narrative of the event.² That this earlier version was current in Anglo-Saxon England is clear from Blickling Homily XIII, which presents in Old English this story of the *Assumption*, differing from the commonly known *Transitus A* and *B*. It is to be noted, however, that *Transitus B* was itself known in Anglo-Saxon England, since a vernacular text of it was transcribed in the margins of MS. 41 of the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.³ It is obviously to narratives of the type of Blickling Homily XIII and that in MS. CCCC 41 that Ælfric alludes, when he inveighs against the unscriptural accounts, current in his time, of Our Lady's last days.⁴

Blickling Homily XIII is a notoriously bad text,⁵ and to understand its features it is necessary to turn to the Eastern redactions of this apocryphon, since its kinship is, in certain respects, closer to them than it is to the A- and B-texts. Its source has for a long time baffled scholars. That it reposed on a Latin original has been obvious from the Latin quotations that are scattered throughout it. These cannot be the work of the translator, wishing to add flavour to his text, as may be seen from the second Latin tag on page 141, "*Benedicite fratres ;*" *et dixerunt Petrus*. Had he been merely embellishing, he would have stopped after *fratres*. Morris remarks

¹ Tischendorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-136. For an English translation, see James, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-216. I shall refer to it as *Transitus B*.

² *Analecta Reginensia*, p. 323 and note 6.

³ Pp. 280-287. This homily, hitherto unpublished, I am preparing for publication.

⁴ Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, p. 158, note. Morris quotes from Benjamin Thorpe's edition of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies: The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, London, 1846, ii. 444.

⁵ As, in fact, are others of the Blickling Homilies; see Max Förster, "Zu den Blickling Homilies," in *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen*, xci, 1893, pp. 178 and 206. Förster demonstrates this in the case of individual homilies in the intervening pages. See also two other studies by Professor Förster, "Altenglische Predigtquellen: 1. Pseudo-Augustin und die 7. Blickling Homily," in *Archiv*, cxvi, 1906, pp. 301-307, and "6. Petrus Chrysologus und die 14. Blickling Homily," in *Archiv*, cxvii, 1909, pp. 246-256, particularly the latter.

in marginal note 2 that *et dixerunt Petrus* should properly come in the next line after the last words of the translation of the *Benedicite fratres*: *Bletsiað ge broðor þa leofestan, urne Drihten*, and before the next sentence: *þa cwæð Petrus and Andreas to Iohanne*. True, but the method of the Old English translator is to quote a few words of his source, and then translate ahead disregarding his quotation.

Recently the long-looked-for Latin source of Blickling Homily XIII came to light. Dom Wilmart had the good fortune to come upon no less than ten Latin manuscripts containing this redaction of the *Assumption*, and he presents us for the first time with this Latin apocryphon, whose existence has been assumed but which has never been discovered before.¹ The basis of his printed edition is the text in MS. Reginensis Latin 119 of the Vatican Library, a twelfth-century manuscript, probably of French origin, in the collection of Queen Christina of Sweden. The version as published is, as he points out, not an ordinary edition, but a sort of neutral text, based on MS. Reginensis Lat. 119, into which he has introduced readings from the other manuscripts so as to give a fluent version of this apocryphon—this in addition to presenting the variant readings in the usual way.²

A comparison of the Old English of Blickling Homily XIII with Wilmart's Latin narrative at once establishes the fact that some text of the latter is the direct source of the former, and it also gives the solution to many of the perplexing features and contradictions of the Old English. There is no doubt that the Old English translator was beyond his depth in dealing with his Latin sources, and his translation reminds one of the efforts of a beginning student in turning his Latin original into the vernacular: it is now equally clear, moreover, that the translator was working from an exceedingly difficult and faulty Latin text.

It is remarkable that, once the lost Latin version turned up, so many specimens of it were found to exist. Wilmart lists ten different copies, though to one of them, the Ivrea manuscript, he did not succeed in gaining access.³ They are all Western manuscripts. Nor is this version of the *Assumption* limited in Old English to one copy alone; a variant manuscript of this translation occurs in MS. 198 of the Library of Corpus Christi College,

¹ *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 325-357.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 324-325. I call Wilmart's text *Transitus C*.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 324, note 1.

Cambridge, an eleventh-century text.¹ This gives us at least twelve texts in all,² ten Latin and two Old English, of *Transitus C*, this third Latin redaction of the *Assumption of the Virgin*.

It should be added that there is still another Latin redaction of the *Assumption*, which might be termed *Transitus D*. It is included by Wilmar as an appendix to *Transitus C*, *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 357-362. This is a translation in Latin, slightly abbreviated, of Tischendorf's Greek narrative. For an English translation of the Greek, see James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 201-209. For the sake of completeness, mention might be made here of that very important variant of *Transitus B* in MS. L.58 of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, certain readings of which shed light on otherwise unique readings in the Blickling text. Tischendorf printed excerpts from it in the prolegomena to his *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, pp. xliii-xlvi, and the interesting accompanying illuminations of the MS. in *The Apocryphal New Testament, Canonical History and Apocryphal Legends Relating to New Testament*, Milan, 1873, fol. 75^v-80^v (where the text breaks off incomplete). This we might term *Transitus E*.

A word ought to be said of the relationship of Blickling to the variant Old English text in MS. CCCC 198. It is extraordinary how few variant readings are to be recorded in editing either with the other as a second text. From the opening section of the Blickling homily up to the lost leaf on page 139 of Morris's edition the following variants are to be recorded from the Corpus Christi manuscript :

Blickling	CCCC 198
p. 137, 20 gehyraþ, segþ, þissum	gehyrað, segð, ðissum
21 fæmnan	femnan, but æ superscript above e.
22 þas	ðas
23 hie, þa	hi, ða
24 cweþende	cweðende
25 þissum, þe, for þan, soþlice	ðissum, ðe, for ðan, soðlice
26 þrim, þinum, Drihtnes	ðrim, ðinum, driht
27 beoþ, cwæþ	beoð, cwæð

¹ Fol. 350^r-359^r.

² I would not be surprised if the Irish text in *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum* were, after all, of this complexion, rather than a B-text. See St. John D. Seymour, "Irish Versions of the *Transitus Mariæ*," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxiii, 1921, pp. 36-43.

Blickling	CCCC 198
p. 137, 28 þæm, þa cwæþ	ðæm, ða cwæð
29 forþon	forðon
30 þis, gehyrde, þa, þone	ðis, geherde, ða, ðone
31 soþlice, swiþe	soðlice, swiðe
32 þa, þe	ða, ðe
33 þær, þæs, swiþe, wynsumiende	ðær, ðæs, swyðe, wynsumigende

From here on I ignore variants of *þ* and *ð*.

p. 139, 1 mycle	micelre, <i>y superscript over a deleted original i.</i>
2 hie, astah, heofenas	hi, astag, heofonas
3 myclum	micclum
4 eaþmodnesse	eadmodnesse
7 gegyred	gegyrwed
8 blissigende	blissiende
10 mycel	micel
16 cleopigende	cleopiende
17 cweðende, gehyraþ	cwæðende, geheraþ
22 þis	ðys

These variants are, it is evident, of a relatively slight nature. Most of them are in the use of *þ* and *ð*; Blickling shows a preference for the former, CCCC 198 for the latter. The Cambridge manuscript has a fondness for *e* as *i*-umlaut of *ēa*. *Cwæðende* for *cweðende* is another characteristic of this manuscript. In the matter of date, Blickling is earlier than the Cambridge manuscript. The famous occurrence of the date on page 141 of the Blickling manuscript, page 119 of Morris's edition, makes it certain that the manuscript is after, though it is probably somewhat near, A.D. 971; the texts themselves, however, must be earlier. It is impossible, then, that the Blickling text of the end of the tenth century was copied from the full eleventh-century Cambridge manuscript. In addition, quite a number of words present in Blickling were dropped in copying in CCCC 198. On the other hand, there are a few readings in CCCC 198 not in Blickling, and it is, therefore, unlikely that the former was copied from the latter. Certainly, they are very closely related, and if CCCC 198 was not taken directly from Blickling, they were both copied from the same source or from very closely related sources. It might be added that exactly the same kinship is revealed in the texts of the prose *Andreas* to be found

in these same two manuscripts.¹ Probably the *Andreas* and the *Assumption* were found in Old English translation in the same codex, whence they were copied, once at the end of tenth century in Blickling and later in the eleventh century in CCCC 198.

The existence of a lacuna in Blickling Homily XIII, at the end of line 22 of page 139 of Morris's printed text, was apparent from the lack of continuity between what had preceded and what follows at this point. Morris estimated, as his note indicates, that one or more leaves were missing between pages 168 and 169 of the Blickling manuscript. The passage in question reads as follows:

' & mid þy þe heo þis gecweden hæfde þa com þær sona se eadega [*A leaf, or perhaps more, is missing here.*] dura ðæra halgan Marian, & hie gesawon be him tweonum. . . .'²

In translating this passage, Morris guessed from the mention of them in the section immediately after the hiatus that it might be the Blessed Peter and Paul who arrive at this moment; as the Latin shows, however, it is the Blessed John who now comes forth, and only later Saints Peter and Paul. From the length of the passage in question, which appears in the variant text in MS. CCCC 198, it is clear that only a single leaf, or half-sheet, is gone here from the Blickling *Assumption*, since the missing matter is just enough to fill two sides of a page of the Blickling format. This must have existed in the Blickling Homily on a single leaf, and could easily have got loosened from the body of the book and thus lost.

The presence in MS. CCCC 198 of the passage missing from the Blickling text makes it possible to fill up the gap in this Old English translation of Transitus C of the *Assumption of the Virgin*. I print below the Old English text from the Corpus Christi College manuscript, and I add the appropriate portion of the source from Wilmart's Latin text; a comparison of the two enables me to understand the Old English, which is very difficult, and I indicate how the translator has interpreted his original.

On page 141 of his edition, Morris notes another place at which

¹ The *Andreas* appears in the Blickling Homilies, on pp. 228-249 of Morris's edition, and on fol. 386 ff. of MS. CCCC 198. The Corpus Christi version has been twice published: once by C. W. Goodwin, *The Anglo-Saxon Legends of St. Andrew and St. Veronica*, Cambridge, 1851, and again by James W. Bright in his *Anglo-Saxon Reader*. In the fourth edition, New York, 1917 [reprinted March, 1928], it forms the thirteenth text, pp. 113-128. Compare the variant readings recorded by Bright for the *Andreas* with those given above as a sample from the *Assumption*.

² *Blickling Homilies*, p. 139, ll. 22-23.

a leaf or so seems to be missing. In this instance, however, the Cambridge manuscript agrees absolutely with Blickling, and it can thus supply nothing here. Actually, however, there is nothing missing, as the Latin makes clear. We have to do in this case, not with a lost leaf, but with awkward and bewildered translation.¹

In printing the section in question from MS. CCCC 198, I number the Old English in accordance with Wilmart's divisions of the Latin for convenience in cross reference. I expand abbreviations, indicating them in the usual way, except for "and," which I print always without italics, since it is almost always represented in this manuscript by the regular abbreviation. The punctuation and capitalization are, of course, mine.

Occasionally a reading from one of Wilmart's variant manuscripts will be closer to what the Old English translator had before him than is Wilmart's Latin text. Partly for convenience in reference and partly for the sake of giving a complete list of these manuscripts, I enumerate all the texts at present recognized as *Transitus C*. To avoid confusion I follow Wilmart's designations² of his Latin manuscripts; I indicate his printed text by L, Blickling Homily XIII by Bl, and MS. CCCC 198 by C:

B, MS. Fonds Baluze 270, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, fol. 167-174 (VIII-IX cent.). Latin.

Bl, Blickling Homily XIII, pp. 166-194 of the manuscript in the possession of the Marquis of Lothian. (About 971 A.D.) Old English, published by Richard Morris, *The Blickling Homilies of the Tenth Century, Early English Text Society*, LVIII, LXIII, and LXXVIII, London, 1874-1880, pp. 136-159.

C, MS. 198, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, fol. 350-359 (XI cent.). Old English.

F, MS. Nouvelles Acquisitions Latines 1605, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, fol. 22^v, 27^r-30^v (X-XI cent.). Latin.

G, MS. 732, Stiftsbibliothek, Saint-Gall, fol. 115-142 (IX cent.). Latin.

I, MS. 59, Ivrea, 10^v-12 (XI cent.). Latin.

L, Wilmart's *Adsumptio Sanctae Mariae*, published in *Analecta Reginensia, Studi e Testi*, LIX, Città del Vaticano, 1933, pp. 325-357. A general Latin text based on R.

¹ See below, p. 16.

² *Analecta Reginensia*, p. 324.

- M, MS. Fonds Latin 13781, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, fol. 20-24 (XIII cent.). Latin.
 P, MS. Palat. Lat. 430, Vatican Library, fol. 109-111 (IX cent.). Latin.
 R, MS. Reginensis Lat. 119, Vatican Library, fol. 132^r-135^v (XII cent.). Latin. The basis of Wilmart's text, *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 325-357.
 S, MS. Sessoriano 121, Biblioteca Nazionale, Rome, fol. 83^v-93^r (XIII cent.). Latin.
 T, MS. 1396, Bibliothèque Municipale, Troyes, fol. 45^v-48^r (XIII cent.). Latin.
 V, MS. Fonds Reconstitué 2, Silos, fol. 188-205 (XI cent.). Latin.

I refer to the Blickling Homily by page and line, according to Morris's edition, and to Wilmart's Latin text by section and verse, since he prints it in that fashion. Thus L 3. 4 refers to the fourth "verse" of section 3 of Wilmart's Latin text (as printed on page 326 of his edition). When it is necessary to quote variant readings from the other Latin manuscripts, I shall refer to the particular manuscript by the key letter as given above.

In the sequel to this article, I intend to study the Blickling translation with the Latin original, and I shall attempt to explain the apparently incomprehensible version of the *Assumption of the Virgin* as we know it in Morris's edition. Morris has done valiant service in making anything at all out of his material. The Latin supplies the key to many of the problems that he encountered.

MS. CCCC 198 ¹Wilmart's Latin Text ²

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>7. 1 And mid ðy ðe heo ðys ge-
 cweden hæfde, ða com ðær sona
 se eadega [<i>here Blickling breaks
 off</i>] Iohannes,
 2 and slog on ða duru ðæs huses,
 ƿæt heo onarn, and wæs ingan-
 gende to hire.
 3 And geseah ƿæt Sancta Maria
 wæs gedrefedu on hire gaste, and
 heo sworette; and heo ne mihte
 forhabban, ƿæt heo ne weope;</p> | <p>Et dum haec loquerentur, ecce
 subito aduenit beatus Iohannes,
 2 et percussit ostium domus et
 ingressus est.
 3 Adubi eum uidit Maria, turbata
 est in spiritu suo, et suspirans non
 potuit tenere lacrimas.</p> |
|---|--|

¹ Fol. 350^v, line 21—fol. 351^r, line 11.

² *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 329-332.

MS. CCCC 198

Wilmart's Latin Text

4 and was cweðende, 'Fæder
Iohannes, westu gemindig min,
forðon ðe Drihten [fol. 351^r] is
ðinra beboda lareow, and *þæt*
he me bebead *þæt* ic gefille

5 on ðisum dæge.¹ He gewat
fram us, *þæt* he wolde ðrowian
for middaneardes hælo'.

8. 1 And ða cwæð se halga
Iohannes to hire, 'Hwæt wilt ðu
þæt ic ðe doo ?'

2 ða andsworede him seo halige
Maria, and was cwæðende, 'Ne
bidde ic ðe nanes ðinges elles
buton *þæt* ðu gehealde minne
lichoman, and hine gesette on
byrgenne ;

3 forðon ðe ic beo, ær ðrim
dagum, gongende of minum
lichoman'.

4 ða gehyrde se halga Iohannes
þæt ða Iudeas cwædan, 'Uton
we nu gan, and acwellan ða
apostolas,

5 and Marian lichoman geni-
man, and hire forbærnan'.

6 Mid ðy ðe ðis gehyrde se
eadiga Iohannes, ða wæs he²
cweðende, 'Of ðisum dæge he²
gewat fram us of lichoman,

7 and he ða wæs wepende on
Godes gesyhðe, and cweðende,
"Eala, Drihten, hwæt syndon
we ðe ðu gecyðdest swa micle
sorge ?'"

9. 1 And ða cegde seo halige
Maria to ðem halgan Iohanne on
hire hordcofan,³

2 and him æteowde ealne hire
gyrelan,

3 and *þæt* scinende pealmtwig

4 Et sic exclamauit uoce magna,
dicens, 'Pater Iohannes, memor
esto sermonis domini mei magistri
tui, quibus me tibi commendauit

5 in qua die recessit a nobis,
passus pro mundi salute'.

1 Et dixit ad eam Iohannes,
'Quid uis ut faciam tibi ?'

2 Respondit Maria, dicens, 'Nihil
aliud quaero nisi ut custodias
corpus meum et ponas illud in
monumento,

3 quia die crastina sum recessura
de corpore.

4 Siquidem ipsa audiui, dicen-
tibus Iudaeis, "Sustineamus quan-
do moriatur,

5 ut possimus corpus eius inue-
nire, et igne consumamus".

6 Haec enim cum audisset beatus
Iohannes, dicente illa quod esset
recessura de corpore,

7 fleuit in conspectu dei, dicens
'O domine, quid sumus nos,
quibus demonstrasti tantas tribu-
lationes ?'

1 Tunc Maria rogauit sanctum
Iohannem in cubiculo suo,

2 et ostendit ei uestimenta sua
quae ei poneret ad sepulturam,

3 et ostendit ei illam palmam

¹ In the Old English verses 4 and 5 of chapter 7 are very difficult to interpret ; the Latin, however, is clear enough. See below, p. 12.

² The temptation is to emend *he* to *heo*, in accordance with the Latin. I believe, however, that the translator intended *he* ; see below, p. 13.

³ The scribe wrote *heortan* originally, but deleted *-eortan*, and wrote in *ordcofan* above the line.

MS. CCCC 198

Wilmart's Latin Text

ðe heo onfeng of ðæs engles handa. And heo him æteowde ealle hire medomnesse.

4 and cwæð to him, 'Ic ðe bidde, Fæder Iohannes, *þæt* ðu ðis palmtwig onfo, and hit ðonne ber beforan minre bæran, mid ðy ðe ic sy gongende of minum lichoman'.

10. 1 Ða cwæð se halga Iohannes to hire, 'Ne mæge ic *þæt* ana don; ac her cumað mine efnapostolas to me,

2 and we ðonne beoð ealle on annesse gesamnode [*fol. 351^v*] on ðisse stowe ðurh Drihtnes mægen, to alysnesse ðines lichoman'.

11. 1 Mid ðy ðe he ðis gecweden hæfde, ða wæs he gongende of hire hordcofan; ða wæs semninga geworden micel ðunnorad, 2 *þæt* eall seo stow wæs gedrefedu, and eall ða ðe *þær* wæron on ðæm huse.

3 And ða semninga ealle ða apostolas tugon hie upp mid wolcnum, and sume hie wæron gesette beforan *þæs* huses [*here Blickling continues*] dura ðære halgan Marian.

4 And hie gesawon be him tweonum, *þæt* heo wæs gewuldod. And hie ða haletton on hie, and hie cwædon, '*Deo gratias*. . .'

luminis quam acceperat ab angelo qui ei apparuerat et eius adsumptionem ei praedixerat.

4 Et dixit ad eum, 'Rogo te, pater Iohannes, ut hanc palmam accipias et facias eam ferre ante lectum meum, cum de hoc corpore fuero adsumpta'.

1 Et dixit ad eam sanctus Iohannes, 'Hoc enim non possum facere solus, nisi aduenerint fratres et coapostoli mei,

2 quoniam hodie omnes in unum sumus congregandi in hunc locum per uirtutem domini, ad reddendum honorem corpusculi tui'.

1 Et cum hoc dixisset, egredientibus illis de cubiculo, subito factum est tonitruum magnum,

2 ita ut turbaretur locus ille, et omnes qui ibidem erant in domo.

3 Et sic subito omnes apostoli cum nubibus rapti sunt, et depositi sunt ante ostium domus beatae Mariae.

4 Et uidentes se inuicem, admirantes salutauerunt, dicentes, '*Deo gratias*. . .'

I translate the Old English, so as to complete the modern English version of this homily as given us by Morris. I render it according to my understanding of what the Old English translator actually wrote, and not what, as the Latin shows me, he ought to have written.

7 And when she had said this, there came suddenly the blessed [*Blickling breaks off here*] John, and he knocked on the door of the house, that it opened, and he went in to where she was, and he saw

that Saint Mary was troubled in her spirit ; and she sighed, and she could not keep from weeping, and she said, " Father John, be thou mindful of me, for the Lord is the teacher of thy commandments ; and what he commanded me, that I fulfill on this day. He went from us, that he might suffer for the salvation of the world."

- 8 And then the holy John said to her, " What wilt thou that I do for thee ? " Then the holy Mary answered him, and said, " I do not ask thee anything else, but that thou keep my body, and lay it in the grave ; for, before three days, I shall depart from my body." Then the holy John heard that the Jews said, " Let us go now, and kill the Apostles, and take Mary's body, and burn her." When the blessed John heard this, then said he, " On this day He went from us, out of the body." And he then was weeping in God's sight, and said, " Behold, Lord, who are we, that Thou shouldst reveal so great sorrow ? "
- 9 And then the holy Mary called to the holy John in her bed-chamber, and she showed him all her raiment, and the shining palm branch which she had received of the angel's hands. And she showed him all her preparation (?), and she said to him, " I bid thee, Father John, that thou take this palm branch, and bear it then before my bier, when I shall go forth from my body."
- 10 Then the holy John said to her, " I can not do that alone ; but my fellow Apostles shall come hither to me, and then shall we all be gathered together in unity through the power of the Lord, to the protection of thy body."
- 11 When he had said this, then went he forth from her bed-chamber. Then was there suddenly a great peal of thunder, that the whole place was shaken, and all those that were in the house. And then suddenly all the Apostles went up in clouds, and they were set down before the door of the house [*Blickling begins again*] of the holy Mary. And they beheld one another, that they were astonished [*the Old English reads* " that she was glorified "], and they saluted one another, and they said, " Deo gratias." . . .

In the discussion which follows, I indicate the section and verse after Wilmart's numbering of them, and I arrange the passages under consideration in accordance with their order in the texts.

7. 1 It is clear now that it is Saint John who comes up at this moment, and not Saints Peter and Paul, as Morris guessed, though they also appear, but later, brought thither likewise in the same miraculous fashion.¹

2 *pæt heo onarn* does not correspond to anything in L as Wilmart gives it. One of the variant texts must have contained a clause which gave rise to this detail in the Old

¹ On the arrival of the Apostles, see below, the discussion of 11. 3.

English. Variant MS. M does contain such a clause: *et continuo aperuit*.

3 According to the Latin, when Mary saw Saint John, she was troubled in spirit. Our translator ought, then, to have written *and þa heo geseah þæt*, instead of *geseah þæt*.

4 It is to be observed that the Old English does not translate *Et sic exclamauit uoce magna*, perhaps for the reason that it was omitted from the Latin text from which the translator was working, as it is in variant manuscripts B and R.

4-5 The translator had had trouble with his source. The two genitive phrases of the original, *domini mei magistri tui*, seem to have been too much for him, possibly because his text may have been defective. It is to be noted that he does not translate *sermonis*, suggesting that perhaps it was missing from his Latin source, as it is in MSS. G, M, and T. But, although these three manuscripts omit *sermonis*, they substitute for it *praeceptis* (G), *praeceptuorum* (MT), so that their texts read something like this: *memor esto domini mei magistri tui praeceptis* (or *praeceptuorum*). A reading of this sort would explain the Old English translation, and if *domini* were by any chance out of place or were misread as *dominus*, we would have something nearer to what our translator must have had before him in his source. Whatever it was, it puzzled him, and he seems to have interpreted it as a garbled version of *memor esto mei, quia dominus est magister tuorum praeceptuorum*. His *þæt he me bebead þæt ic gefille on ðisum dæge he gewat fram us* is far from clear. The Latin reads *quibus [praeceptis or sermonibus understood] me tibi commendauit in qua die recessit a nobis, passus pro mundi salute*. We should expect from the Latin something more like *þæt he me þe bebead on ðisum dæge*, etc. This suggests that *þæt ic gefille* is to be attributed to the translator, or perhaps reviser, to whom the original meaning of the passage was obscure, and who, therefore, added this in the interests of intelligibility, only to succeed in making confusion worse confounded. Possibly *tibi* was missing in the Latin source, in which case he would interpret *commendauit* as *commandauit*. This would explain *bebead*. Perhaps what he is trying to say is "and what he commanded me, that I shall fulfill on this day, [the memorial of that] on which he departed from us. . . ." In accordance with this interpretation, I ought to add *þe* after *dæge*.

8. 4 The Latin reads *Siquidem ipsa audiui, dicentibus Iudaeis*—"I myself have heard the Jews saying." The translator has not understood the precise relationship of this to the rest of the story. The fact that two verses further on, John, *haec cum audisset* (L 8. 6), weeps and exclaims, has led him to take John as the subject of *audiui* of L 8. 4, when it is actually the Virgin. Here she is reporting what she had heard from the Jews with her own ears.¹

6 Here *he* is to be explained as arising from misunderstanding of the original rather than as either a scribal error for *heo* or as the result of the late Old English monophthongization of *eo* to *e*. For *gewat* we should expect *gewite*; but the translator has taken *recessura* to mean *recessus*, and he has interpreted the passage as alluding to the scene at the crucifixion as Our Lord hung on the cross, and committed His mother to St. John. The person weeping the translator takes to be, not St. John, as in the Latin, but the Virgin at the Cross. We can judge that the glossator of MS. CCCC 198 interpreted the passage thus: "When the blessed John heard this, then was he saying, 'On this day he went away from us,' and she then was weeping in God's sight, and saying, 'Oh, Lord, who are we that Thou showest so great sorrow?'" We can assume this since in MS. C the word which I translate as "she" (*he* in the MS.) is glossed *illa* superscript, and "who" (*hwæt* MS.) is glossed *qui*. Certainly the relative conjunction *þæt* is to be inserted after *cweðende*, both *he's* are to be emended to *heo*, and *gewat* altered to *gewite*, if the Old English is to be brought into accord with the Latin original.

9. 1 *rogauit*; but MSS. FRS read *uocauit*, a reading which must have occurred also in the direct source of the Old English.
 2 The Old English omits *quae ei poneret ad sepulturam*.
 3 For *illam palmam luminis quam acceperat ab angelo qui ei apparuerat et eius adsumptionem ei praedixerat*, the Old English translator has *and þæt scinende pealmtwig ðe heo ær onfeng of ðaes englas handa, and heo him æteowode ealle hire medomnesse. Qui ei apparuerat* is, apparently, omitted; *et eius adsumptionem*

¹ For the threats of the Jews, cf. the Greek narrative, James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 201.2, and p. 206.29, and *Transitus B*, the Pseudo-Melito Latin version, *ibid.*, p. 211, IV. It is made much of in the Syriac; cf. James's analyses of the Syriac versions, *op. cit.*, pp. 219 ff. For a Latin translation of the Greek, see *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 357-362.

ei praedixerat probably corresponds to *and heo him æteowde ealle hire medomnesse*, of which it is by no means an accurate translation. *Praedixerat* could, with some licence, be rendered as *heo æteowde*; but what is *medomnesse* and how does it correspond to *adsumptionem*? *Medomnes* occurs again in this homily, *Blickling Homilies*, p. 145, line 33. There it equals *benignitas*, which, however, hardly suits the present situation, where it is more likely to mean "humility" or "submissiveness."

A twelfth-century reader of the Corpus Christi manuscript has interpreted it to mean "worth, virtue, excellence, dignity," since he has glossed *medomnesse* as *dignitas*. Remembering the great humility of Our Lady at the annunciation both of the birth of the Saviour and of her own death, one is tempted to render *medomnesse* as "humility." Could it possibly be a scribal error for *edmodnesse* (*ed=ead*—)? Or is it "moderation"? The logical meaning, when the preceding clauses of the Latin are considered, is "preparation," everything "suitable for the occasion." *Medomnesse* is unrecorded with this meaning, but *medume* does exist with the sense of "proper, fitting," cf. Bosworth-Toller, *medume* III, and in this sense it approaches *dignus* in certain of its meanings. If it is taken as "preparation," "things fitting for the occasion," then the *ealle* of the Old English has some meaning. I have, therefore, so taken *medomnesse* in my translation of this particular passage. It is true that none of these meanings are in translation of the Latin as it comes to us in Wilmart's printed text or in the variant manuscripts. Possibly here the translator is introducing a comment of his own, by way of transition, as he omits a phrase or two of his original.

4 L *ante lectum meum*; C *beforan minum lichoman*; the source of C must have read *ante corpus meum*.

10. 1 Possibly originally the version read *ac gif* in translation of the *nisi* of the Latin. More probably the translator altered his original a little, extending the future of the next sentence, L 10. 2, to L 10. 1, substituting it for the conditional of *aduenerint*.

2 The *hodie* of the Latin is not translated.

C to *alysnesse*, L *ad reddendum honorem*. The absence of anything corresponding to *honorem* in the Old English suggests

that this word might have been missing in the direct source from which the translation was made. In that case the translator was left to make the best he could out of *reddendum* . . . *corpusculi tui*, which he translated to *alysnesse ðines lichoman*, "to the deliverance of thy body." If this definition is acceptable, then we have here a shade of meaning of *aliesednes* not previously recorded. It should be added, however, that neither *reddo* nor *redeo* have this meaning; *redimio* does. Possibly the translator had before him, or thought he had, or interpreted what he had as, *redimendum* instead of *reddendum*.

11. 3 *Rapti sunt* of the Latin is rendered by *tugon hie upp*; cf. German *zogen sich empor*.

sume is difficult. The construction *sume hie*, "some of them," is usual enough in Old English construction, but it does not fit the context. Certainly if all the Apostles were taken up by the cloud that surrounded them¹ and transported them from their several stations, depositing them before the door of the Virgin's house, we are not to assume that only certain ones arrived, while others were held back and kept somewhere in suspense. In the Greek narrative of the Assumption² each of the Apostles explains where he was and what he was doing when the cloud took him up. According to the late *Transitus A*, Thomas³ did not arrive before the door of Mary's house with his fellow Apostles in the clouds, but came up later, just in time to behold the Assumption of Our Lady into heaven. In answer to his request that he be granted some token whereby he might convince his brothers that he too had witnessed her Assumption, she threw him her girdle. This episode was in Raphael's mind when he executed his painting of the Assumption and Coronation of the Virgin. The Apostles stand about her tomb, gazing up towards heaven. Saint Thomas holds Our Lady's girdle in his hands. This account, however, is considered late by James, who remarks that "the episode of Thomas and the girdle is peculiar to *Transitus A*. The girdle is a great relic of Prato, and the

¹ On the assembling of the Apostles, see Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, p. xxxvi, note 5. According to the Syriac, those Apostles that had died were brought to life again for this occasion. That St. Paul was also brought with the Apostles is apparent from the sequel, *Blickling Homilies*, p. 139, line 33.

² James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 203, sections 17-24.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 217, section 2.

prominence given to this incident is another indication that we have here a mediæval Italian composition, not earlier, I imagine, than the thirteenth century."¹

It is possible, however, that the germ of this tradition of Thomas's absence from the gathering of the Apostles was earlier, and may have been known, through popular ecclesiastical narrative at least, before it was fixed and localized in the Prato tradition. If this were true, it might account for the *sume* of the Old English translator. In my English I render *sume hie* simple by "they." Is *sume* translation by any chance a scribal error for (to)somne? If so, it does not occupy the position in the sentence that one would expect it to.

Morris observes on page 141 of Blickling Homily XIII that there is another break in the text, with the loss of a leaf or more between *ƿ gehyræ ge ealle* of line 22 (which corresponds to the end of line 27 of folio 352^r of MS. CCCC 198) and *ƿ þæt he was gongende*, etc., of line 23 (corresponding to the beginning of line 28 of the same folio of the Cambridge manuscript). It will be seen that the Cambridge text simply verifies the accuracy of Blickling in preserving the reading of their common Old English source: Cambridge supports Blickling in every detail. It will be further observed that we do not have here an instance of a loss after the conclusion of a page—that is, the loss of a leaf or more; at least, not of the Blickling text, for the "break" occurs four words before the end of page 170 of the MS. is reached, and there is continuity between these four words, which end this page, and the words that begin the next, page 171 of the Blickling manuscript. It is not the state of the manuscript that suggests a lacuna, but rather the apparent break in continuity within the preserved text that led Morris to suspect that matter was lost in the source of the Blickling text.

When we come to compare the Old English with the Latin, we find that it is not a loss of text that explains the apparent lack of continuity in this section of the Assumption homily; it is, rather, bad translation. To set the matter forth clearly, I reprint the Old English and the Latin, setting the one beside the other, and I use

¹ James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 218, note. According to the Greek narrative, section 20, Thomas is reported as arriving from India at the same time as the other Apostles. *Ibid.*, p. 204, section 7.

the mechanical device of dividing the combined texts into numbered sections for convenience in reference.

- 1 a cwæp Iohannes, : Et dixit ad eos Iohannes,
- 2 ' Bletsiað, broþor þa leofestan, urne God ' : ' Benedicite deo, fratres '.
- 3 & gehyrp : Audite
- 4 ge ealle : _____ [*Morris assumes a break after ge ealle.*]
- 5 _____ : quid mihi contigerit.
- 6 _____ : Factum est
- 7 þæt he wæs gongende : dum essem
- 8 todæg : _____
- 9 on þas ceastre, : in ciuitate
- 10 _____ : Agathen
- 11 & he wæs lærende : docens
- 12 þæt ge eow gebædon to Gode : _____
- 13 on þa nigopan tid þæs dæges ; : Erat hora circiter nona dies.
- 14 & þa semninga astag mycel wolcen : Subito descendit nubes.

In sections 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 13, and 14 the correspondence between the Old English and the Latin is close enough to require no further comment. *Ge ealle*, of 4, suggests that the translator may have had before him *audite uos omnes*, though *ge ealle* may be merely an expansive treatment of the original *audite*. 5 and 10 have nothing corresponding to them in the Old English, and 8 and 12 correspond to nothing in the Latin. The sudden appearance of the third person in 7 and 10, is, perhaps, to be explained as a misreading of the Latin. If *essem* were in an abbreviated form, the translator, or some scribe before him, might have misexpanded it as *esset*, which would explain the translation *þæt he wæs gongende*. 12 has nothing in the Latin to correspond to it. Could it by any chance be a desperate effort of the bewildered translator to make something out of 10, *Agathen*? Suppose it stood in his source in the form *agate*, as it is in variant MS. R. This might be misinterpreted as *agite*, as part of some such phrase as *gratias agite* or *preces agite*, and so give rise to the translation *þæt ge eow gebædon to Gode*.

It is clear from all this that the lacuna or lacunæ in this particular passage are the result of dropping out of only a phrase or so of the original, and that we are not faced with the loss of a leaf of the Blickling manuscript. The impression that a considerable lacuna exists arises from the difficulty experienced by the Old English translator and the nature of his translation.

THE VOCABULARY OF THE FIRST QUARTO OF *HAMLET*

BY ALFRED HART

THE first quarto of *Hamlet*¹ is certainly one of those "diverse, stolne, and surreptitious copies" which Heminge and Condell condemn in their address "To the great Variety of Readers" prefixed to the First Folio. The authentic *Hamlet*² is Shakespeare's longest play and has the largest vocabulary of all his plays. I count 3,872 words in the 3,762 lines of the received text (Cambridge Edition, vol. viii., 1866), and 2,251 words in the 2,153 irregular lines of the first quarto (facsimile text in the same volume of the Cambridge Edition). The reduction in the number of lines would seem to have carried with it an almost proportional loss of words, but it will be shown that this loss is far greater than the reduction in the number of lines warrants.

Reference to the concordance shows that 1,956 of the 2,251 words in Q1 are in *Hamlet*. The following table gives the distribution of the scarcer words in the two texts.

TABLE I

	<i>Hamlet</i>	Q1	Loss
1. Total number of words used by Shakespeare	3,872	1,956	1,916
2. Number of words peculiar to play	375	89	286
3. Number of words used in one other play . .	237	71	166
4. Number of words used in two other plays	180	52	128
5. Number of words used in three other plays	150	51	99
Total number of less common words	942	263	679
6. Number of words not used in earlier plays	554	143	411

N.B.—The totals in the last line are of words previously unused by the poet and include all those peculiar to the play, and some of those included in the totals given in the other rows.

¹ For convenience and brevity hereinafter termed Q1.

² Hereinafter I call the received text *Hamlet*.

Most critics who believe that Q1 is derived from Q2 suggest rather than affirm that the reporter of Q1 was solely responsible for this extraordinary destruction of text and vocabulary. The wrecking of *Hamlet*, in my opinion, was the work of two hands; each did his own share independently and at different times.

Between the 3,762 lines of the extant *Hamlet* and the 2,153 lines of the extant Q1 lies a lost acting version made by order of the company from the poet's manuscript. Consequently, the reduction of the 3,872 words in *Hamlet* to the 2,251 words in Q1 must also have occurred in two stages, corresponding respectively to the preparation of the acting version and to the subsequent manufacture of the "copy" for Q1. All the evidence available suggests that the making of the stage version of a play did not involve any loss of vocabulary other than that arising from passages struck out by the play-adaptor; whatever was retained almost invariably retained the exact words used by the author. A trustworthy estimate of the number of words present in an abridged or acting version of a long play by Shakespeare can be obtained by finding the number used in one of his short plays belonging to the same period. *Macbeth* (2,084 lines) contains 2,685 words, Shakespeare's part of *Timon of Athens* (1,157 lines) 1,937 words, and *The Tempest* (2,015 lines) 2,595 words. The second quarto of *Hamlet* contains 225 lines and 174 words not in the text of the first folio. *Hamlet* was written at the peak period of the poet's imagination and mental activity, and any acting version prepared from it would still display his magical word-artistry in its infinite variety. An acting version of 2,153 lines (the exact length of Q1) would probably contain about 2,750 of the words in the complete *Hamlet*, and thus the official play-surgeon must be held responsible for cutting out about 1,100 words. After him came the reporting pirate who tossed an additional 820 words overboard; he filled in some of the holes and fissures in the text with nearly 300 words of his own.

Probably the acting version ran to about 2,400 lines and would retain nearly 3,000 of the words present in the full play; the play-cutter would thus have eliminated 1,360 lines of text and about 870 words. A year or more afterwards the reporter began his work; he had forgotten about 400 lines of text and nearly 1,100 of the words left by the actors in their truncated *Hamlet*. Guesses such as these are all that is possible until the acting version turns up. On the

respective demerits and delinquencies of play-adapter and reporter, one must be content with the answer given to young Boswell when he posed Dr. Johnson with the question, did he think Rousseau as bad a man as Voltaire? "Why, sir," said Johnson, "it is difficult to settle the proportion of iniquity between them."

If we assume that Q₁ represents, in the main, a corrupt and garbled abridgment of an acting version prepared for the stage by the actors from the author's manuscript, we may well look aghast at the cumulative effects of the customary abridgment and the subsequent mutilation and corruption of what the actors had left. The length of Q₁ justifies us in expecting that about 540 of the 942 "less common" words in Table I would be retained; *Macbeth* has 473 such words and *The Tempest* 441. We may thus put down the loss of 400 such words to the actors, and of the remaining 280 to the account of the pirate who gave the printers the copy for Q₁. I think it unlikely that the actors cut out as much as 1,600 lines; if they reduced the play to 2,300 lines the loss arising from each of the two destructive agents would be about equal. On the other hand, the comparatively well-preserved abridgment—which is all that the actors left us of the complete *Macbeth*—is shorter than Q₁, as is also *The Tempest*.

Nearly half the vocabulary of *Hamlet* disappeared during these disintegrating processes, but far heavier toll was taken of those fresh, vigorous, vital words that Shakespeare poured with such profusion into this play. Of 554 words used by him for the first time Q₁ has only 143, or little better than a fourth. The majority of the poet's compound adjectives in his late plays are compounds of nouns, adjectives, or adverbs linked to past or present participles, or belong to the so-called parasynthetic forms. In *Hamlet* there are 31 such compounds, most of them of Shakespeare's own making; Q₁ omits all but two. He frequently exhibits a liking in a play for a certain type of word; in *Hamlet* one such type is of words ending in -ment. He uses in all 44, of which 13 are credited to his invention by the compilers of the *Oxford Dictionary*. Q₁ keeps 9 only of these, and only one, *distilment*, of the 13 words "new" to our literature. Of the important groups of adjectives that end in -al, -ant, -ble, -ent, -ful, -ish, -ive, -less, -ous, and -y, *Hamlet* has 316, of which 19 are put down to him in the *Oxford Dictionary* as first-user. The first quarto finds room for 111, but keeps only 3 of the "new" forms. Word novelties seem to have been unpopular

with the actors ; Q1 omits all but 15 of a total of 107 main words that made their debut in our literature in *Hamlet*.

So far I have been discussing words of *Hamlet* not found in Q1, and have assumed that the first quarto is the daughter play, corrupted, maimed, and debased it is true, but indubitably, in the main, a reported play derived from the second quarto of *Hamlet*. The essential point of this assumption is that Q2 had been in existence for eighteen months or perhaps two years before Q1 came to the press. A second theory of the origin of Q1 reverses the order of composition, insisting that Q1 is the first draft or sketch of the play ; Professor Dover Wilson declares that Q1 represents a half-way stage between the so-called "Ur-Hamlet" and Q2. Sir E. K. Chambers in his *William Shakespeare* states this theory succinctly :

He (Professor Wilson) thinks that the reporter did no more than make additions to an early *Hamlet* text. This was an abridged transcript for provincial use from the old play as partly revised by Shakespeare. The revision "had not extended much beyond the Ghost-scenes." The original manuscript remained available for a subsequent further revision by Shakespeare into the *Hamlet* of Q2 and F.¹

Professor Wilson still holds to this theory of partial revision. In his introduction to his edition of *Hamlet* for the Cambridge Press he says, "It looks, therefore, as if Shakespeare may first have handled the play sometime after Lodge's reference of 1596, and then revised it in 1601."² I shall examine the vocabulary of Q1 in relation to the vocabulary of Q2 with the object of getting some relevant facts. Q1 contains 2,251 words which may be divided into two distinct parts :

- (i) 1,915 words found in *Hamlet*, equal to nearly 87 per cent. of the total vocabulary of Q1.
- (ii) 295 words not in *Hamlet*, or a little more than 13 per cent. of the total vocabulary of Q1.

Explanation of the presence in Q1 of 1,956 words found in Q2 is not necessary if we accept the theory that Q1 is the illegitimate child of Q2 ; the reporter may be held responsible for the introduction of the 295 alien words. On the other hand, if the above theory of partial revision is valid, Q1 must be divided into :

- (a) the part revised by Shakespeare, and
- (b) the part unrevised.

¹ *William Shakespeare*, vol. i., p. 420.

² J. Dover Wilson, *Hamlet* (1934), p. xxii.

Part (a) consists of the first four scenes of Q1, and is equivalent to the first act of the received text. Its length is 632 lines and, according to the revision theory, most of this part is Shakespeare's though some of it has been badly damaged in the reporting. The vocabulary therefore will be predominantly Shakespearian. The second part (b) comprises the remaining fourteen scenes of Q1, containing 1,521 lines and corresponding to Acts II.-V. of the received text. Professor Wilson believes that this part was scarcely touched by Shakespeare in his first revision; it was the work of another author. The reporter, in his opinion, had played several small parts in Q2, and added scraps from it to his "copy" when his memory of the old play failed him. The vocabulary of (b) should be mainly that of the other author or authors concerned.

Theories of revision form the starting-point of much ingenious and speculative criticism on *Hamlet* and some other plays of Shakespeare. Does revision mean to these critics exactly the same as it meant to Shakespeare? Five or six years before Q2 was staged he transformed *The Troublesome Raigne of King John* into *King John*; a few years afterwards he rewrote *King Leir*, and the result was *King Lear*. If any critic is in search of first-hand knowledge concerning Shakespeare's methods of rewriting plays he ought, in my opinion, to begin with an intensive examination of the relations between *The Troublesome Raigne* and *King John*. For the purpose of my present inquiry I shall discuss the vocabularies only of these two plays. *The Troublesome Raigne* was printed in two parts each with a separate title-page; the total length is 2,972 lines. The first part runs to 1,755 lines (Furness, Variorum edition) and corresponds roughly to *King John*, Acts I., II., III., IV. i, ii, which contain in all 1,890 lines. Using the vocabulary of *King John* I selected from the first part of *The Troublesome Raigne* all the words that are not found in *King John*; they number 906. I find that there are 1,310 such words in the two parts of *The Troublesome Raigne*, and that the full vocabulary of this play would not exceed 2,700 words.

The result given above is of first-rate importance. My count proves that Shakespeare rejected 906 words during his rewriting of 1,755 lines of *The Troublesome Raigne*. Professor Dover Wilson claims that Shakespeare, during his second revision of Q1, rewrote 1,521 lines of an old play, the almost untouched work of another author. If he did so, he retained nearly seven-eighths

of its vocabulary and rejected only 295 words. These facts do not fit in with this or any other theory of revision. If, in writing *King John*, Shakespeare rejected 1,310 of the 2,700 words present in his source-play and kept 1,400, why did he, in rewriting such a corrupt play as Q1, reverse the process and reject 295 words and keep the remaining 1,956? It is not exceptional for a play to contain 1,500 words not in another play; thus *Edward III* has 1,624 words not in *Edward II* and 1,352 words in common, *Henry V* 1,616 words not in 1 *Henry IV* and 1,560 in common, *King Lear* 1,826 words not found in *Othello* and 1,546 in common, and a short play, e.g. *The Tempest* 1,550 words not in *Midsummer Night's Dream* and 1,045 in common. On the other hand *Arden of Feversham* has 1,035 words not in *The Spanish Tragedy* and 1,211 in common, and *The Massacre at Paris* nearly 600 words not found in *Edward II* and 866 in common. I have collected the complete vocabularies of nearly 40 plays and thus have 780 pairs of plays available for tests. I have examined a number of these pairs and find that 2 *Henry VI* and 3 *Henry VI* have the highest percentage of words common to two plays, viz. 59 per cent. The two parts of *Tamburlaine* show nearly as high a result. Such a large percentage of the two vocabularies will be identical only when the two plays have been written by the same author, on the same theme, and in close sequence at a time when dramatic language was tending to fixity. What explanation can we possibly have of the facts that Q1 has 295 words not in *Hamlet* and 1,956 words in common with it? If Professor Wilson's theory is correct, the unrevised part of Q1 (Acts II.-V.) was in existence at least as early as 1596, or four or five years before *Hamlet* was written. He regards the unrevised part of Q1 and its equivalent in Q2 as independent plays written by different authors in different years. Accordingly, if the vocabularies of Q1 and of any other play are compared, Q1 should have less than the maximum percentage (59) of its words in common with those of the other play and more than the minimum percentage (41) of its words all different from those in the other play. Actually 87 per cent. of the words in Q1 are in *Hamlet* and only 13 per cent. different. Professor Wilson's theory fails because Q1 is not an independent play; it is derived directly from *Hamlet*, and the anomalous results are signs of this dependence and help to prove how it came into existence.

Space does not permit of my giving many details of the changes made by Shakespeare in the vocabulary of *The Troublesome Raigne*

during the process of rewriting. Two are remarkable enough to be worth mention. *The Troublesome Raigne* contains 96 compound words; Shakespeare rejected 92 and retained 4. Q₁ contains 60 compound words; if Shakespeare revised it, he rejected 12 and retained 48. Of adverbs ending in -ly *The Troublesome Raigne* has 42, of which Shakespeare rejected 31 and kept 11. Q₁ has 40 such adverbs; *Hamlet* keeps 36 and omits 4. Once more the extraordinary differences that result respectively from the poet's undoubted rewriting of an old play and from his hypothetical rewriting of the larger part of Q₁ are inexplicable except the hypothesis is abandoned and Q₁ accepted as the garbled and corrupted work of Shakespeare.

I shall now discuss the 295 words in Q₁ which Professor Wilson suggests were rejected by Shakespeare when he made his last revision of the play. Below is set out the distribution of these words among the acts of Q₁; the totals for the second and third acts have been combined because the order of some scenes differs in each version.

	Act I.	Acts II.-III.	Act IV.	Act v.	Total for Play
1. Number of lines in <i>Hamlet</i> ..	850	1,585	649	677	3,761
2. Number of lines in Q ₁ ..	632	918	288	315	2,153
3. Number of words in Q ₁ not found in <i>Hamlet</i>	53	153	48	41	295

The distribution of these words is, on the whole, uniform throughout Q₁; the variation from act to act seems connected with the amount of abridgment and the degree and amount of corruption present. For purpose of comparison and contrast I give similar details illustrating the transformation of *The Troublesome Raigne* into *King John*.

<i>The Troublesome Raigne</i>	No. of Lines	<i>King John</i>	No. of Lines	No. of Words rejected by Shakespeare
Scene i.	416	Act I.	276	215
Scenes ii.-xi.	914	Acts II.-III.	1,211	478
Scenes xii.-xiii.	425	Acts IV. i., ii.	403	213
Totals	1,755		1,890	906

The Troublesome Raigne has a sound text, and the number of words in it for which Shakespeare did not find a place in *King John* is almost exactly proportional in each long scene or group of scenes to the number of lines of text. If Shakespeare's rewriting of an old play five years previous to the composition of *Hamlet* involved the rejection of 906 words from 1,755 lines of text, then it seems almost a misuse of the term to assert that he "rewrote" the 2,153 lines of Q1 because we find in them 295 words that are not in *Hamlet*. Whatever inferences may be reasonably drawn from the presence of these rejected words in Q1 apply with almost equal force to each act. Professor Wilson's theory of double revision requires :

(1) That the vocabulary of the first four scenes of Q1 (Act 1.) should be, except for the omitted passages, almost entirely identical with that of *Hamlet*, Act 1., and therefore the number of words rejected by the poet on the second revision should be very small.

(2) That the vocabulary of Q1 for the remaining fourteen scenes, by hypothesis the work of another author, should differ very widely from the corresponding acts of *Hamlet*, and, accordingly, the number of words rejected by Shakespeare on what was really the first revision of these scenes should be very great in comparison.

The total of 53 words rejected from the first four scenes is small ; but, if Shakespeare had rejected, as in *The Troublesome Raigne*, one word for each two lines of the text of the remaining fourteen scenes of Q1, he should have removed 760 words instead of 242. This condition is not fulfilled, and I maintain that no Shakespearean revision of Q1 has taken place. My figures prove :

1. That the vocabulary, not of the first act alone, but of every act of Q1 is predominantly that of *Hamlet*, due allowance being made for differences in length.

2. That the alien words in each act are comparatively few in number, and are distributed with such a degree of uniformity throughout the play as to give no warrant for the distinction made between the first act and the remainder of the play.

3. That if Shakespeare revised an old play of *Hamlet* about 1600—as I believe he did—and treated it exactly as he had done *The Troublesome Raigne* five years earlier, the number of words rejected would be nearer 1,200 than 300. This play is not extant and was not Q1.

In my opinion a considered acceptance of the results derived

from these and other vocabulary tests must inevitably lead to the rejection of any theory of the relationship between the two early quartos of *Hamlet* which is based on the assumptions that Q1 predates Q2 and has, for all but the first act, a different author.

So far the vocabulary of Q1 has been treated in bulk. All my conclusions depend finally on the important fact that, apart from obvious corruption, the vocabulary of Q1 is not that of any original dramatist, but is derivative. Seven-eighths of it come directly from *Hamlet*.

I shall now discuss the words of Q1 that do not come from *Hamlet*. For some years it has been my practice to treat the concordance to Shakespeare's works as a small dramatic dictionary suitable for the preliminary classification of the vocabularies of plays written by contemporaries of Shakespeare; with its help I divided the 295 words of Q1 that are not in *Hamlet* into two main groups:

A. 24 words not in Shakespeare's works; of these 20 are in Acts II.-V. of Q1.

B. 271 words present in the poems and in Shakespeare's plays other than *Hamlet*.

The following table gives the totals of the non-Shakespearian words found in certain plays written by various authors during the years 1587-1613, and the lengths of the plays named. Short plays have been chosen for the purpose of this comparison.

TABLE II

Name of Play	No. of Lines	No. of Non-Shakespearian Words
<i>Tamburlaine I</i>	2,316	112
<i>Taming of a Shrew</i>	1,550	62
<i>Massacre at Paris</i>	1,263	40
<i>Soliman and Perseda</i>	2,267	70
<i>Lochrine</i>	2,061	150
<i>Cornelia</i> (translation)	2,028	137
<i>Blind Beggar of Alexandria</i>	1,600	55
<i>Humorous Day's Mirth</i>	2,024	70
<i>Pericles</i> (Wilkins' part ?)	1,231	47
<i>Henry VIII</i> (Fletcher's part)	1,639	58
<i>Two Noble Kinsmen</i> (Fletcher's part)	1,681	77
<i>Hamlet</i> (Q1)	2,153	24
<i>Hamlet</i> (Q1, Acts II.-V.)	1,521	20

The above table shows that the totals of non-Shakespearian words present in a play range from 150 for early plays with good texts to a

minimum of 40 for a corrupt and very short abridgment. Chapman's twelve signed plays average 116 such words a play; *May-Day* has 177. The *Massacre at Paris* contains, in my opinion, less than three hundred lines of Marlowe's unaltered play; nearly one half of the play has disappeared and the remainder is a disorderly jumble of telescoped speeches, interpolated lines, actors' gags, etc., yet 40 non-Shakespearian words still remain imbedded in the text. The *Taming of a Shrew* is another tattered and disjointed remnant of a much longer play, and is padded out with cant phrases of the day and lines unblushingly stolen from other plays; after years of such maltreatment it still retains 62 words not in the concordance. Many of these were in everyday use; even such an indefatigable word-monger as Shakespeare could not and did not use all the common words at his disposal. Authors were distinctly individual in their choice and use of words; they did not suffer from mass education or the tyranny of the dictionary, and if in need of a word would frequently make one from an existing stem or adapt to English usage a French, Italian, Latin, or Greek word. How each author held fast to his own vocabulary is apparent in such a play as *Henry VIII*. Though Fletcher admired and imitated the language of Shakespeare, he used on the average one word not found in the other part of the play in every two lines of the 1,639 lines that he wrote. Two passages in Q1, almost certainly not from Shakespeare's pen, illustrate this individuality of vocabulary. The tag of 11 lines appended in Q1 to the prince's advice to the players contains 11 words not found in *Hamlet*; and the fourteenth scene—that between Horatio and the queen—another 12 such words. Neither passage appears in *Hamlet*. The occurrence of 23 words not in *Hamlet* in 47 non-Shakespearian lines of Q1 recalls the fact that Shakespeare rejected 906 words in rewriting 1,755 lines of *The Troublesome Raigne*.

The conclusion that may be deduced from the above list—and it could be much longer—is that every non-Shakespearian play, comparable in length to that of the part of Q1 which Professor Wilson asserts is unrevised, contains more than 50 words not in the Shakespeare concordance. My count shows only 20 such words in the "unrevised" part of Q1, or a third of the number found in *The Taming of a Shrew*. This total of 20 is so small that I cannot accept this or any part of Q1 as the original or unrevised work of any dramatist of the time. If Q1 is, in the main, a

garbled, mutilated, and curtailed report of an official acting version of the author's manuscript made by the play-adapter for representation, or, in other words, if Q2 predates Q1, we have a coherent and simple explanation of the nearly complete identity of the vocabulary of Q1 with that of half of Q2, of the unusually small number of words in Q1 that are not found in *Hamlet*, of the excessive paucity of non-Shakespearian words in Q1, and of the comparatively uniform distribution of the words not found in *Hamlet* throughout the scenes and acts of Q1. The vagaries of the reporter are sufficient to explain most of the other difficulties. To the advocates of the various revision theories I submit the facts given above for explanation in terms of their theories.

An examination of the 271 words in Q1 that are found in plays of Shakespeare other than *Hamlet* seemed worth making. On adding these words to the 1,956 words that are in *Hamlet*, I got the extraordinary result that 2,227 out of 2,251 words in Q1 are found in Shakespeare's works; only 24 are not in the concordance. That nearly 99 per cent. of the vocabulary of a play should consist of words used by Shakespeare, and the play itself be by another author, I think so inconsistent as to be incredible; the only explanation possible is that some one inserted the 24 alien words into an abridged Shakespearian play. I decided to learn something more about these 271 words, and divided them into two groups, one consisting of words used by Shakespeare before he wrote *Hamlet* and the other containing words found for the first time only in the later plays. This subdivision involved my fixing some definite chronological order for the Shakespeare canon, and I accept that adopted by Sir E. K. Chambers in *William Shakespeare*, except that I put *The Merry Wives* before instead of after *Hamlet*. My division of the 270 words showed that:

(i) 258 words are found for the first time in plays written before *Hamlet*, and

(ii) 13 words appear for the first time in plays later than *Hamlet*.

This surprising result was so contrary to any preconceived expectation that it was necessary to look for a satisfactory explanation. What theoretical result ought to be obtained if 271 words were picked at random out of the 16,960 words in the concordance with the sole condition that none of the words in *Hamlet* were available for choice? Shakespeare used about 9,920 words (exclusive of those in *Hamlet*) before *Hamlet* was written, and added 3,200 words

to his vocabulary afterwards. Accordingly the pick should consist of 205 words chosen from those used in plays written prior to *Hamlet* and 66 words chosen from words found for the first time in later plays. The discrepancy between this calculated result and that given above is too great to be put down to the caprice of the goddess Chance; some human agency has been at work, and it is not hard to discover the person responsible. The reporter was a man of the theatre, almost certainly a hired actor who had kept the prompter busy in every one of the many parts he had played in Shakespeare's plays. Like Master William Page, he may have been "a good *sprag* memory," but failed as badly when he tried to answer the call for "copy." He had some sense of fitness and usually patched the holes in Shakespeare with some more or less suitable scrap of Shakespeare, but any bit from any other dramatist was just as welcome. I have traced his ingatherings from at least a dozen of Shakespeare's plays; a line from one, a phrase from a second, a couple of words from a third were heaped together in most admired confusion. He had his touches of vanity. He corrects the poet's Latin—the gravedigger's "argal" must be "ergo"; he puts friend William in his place (and gives the metre a jolt) by changing the new word "illumine" to the usual "illumine"; he may have played a King's part in his time, and thus Queen Hecuba quite decently has "a kercher on that head" instead of a washer-woman's "clout." For an actor he had an indifferent memory; at his best, he seems unable to retain more than three lines of his part word-perfect, and he was rarely at his best. Occasionally he displays some skill in fitting his stolen lines and phrases into their new setting, but when he could not remember or steal something suitable to the dramatic situation he filled the gap with his own execrable rubbish or even plain nonsense. He did not insert words or phrases from plays later than *Hamlet* because he could not; a reporter—at any rate a reporter of Elizabethan plays—could not quote from plays that had not been written or acted. The thirteen words which he did insert were in common use; four of them he probably picked up from *Troilus and Cressida*, which had almost certainly been acted before Q1 was entered on the Stationer's Register.

I think that I have offered a sufficiently satisfactory reason why Q1 contains so few of the 3,200 words that Shakespeare used for the first time in the plays after *Hamlet*. How unusually anomalous

Q1 is in this respect will be evident after reading the following list. Shakespeare introduces 2,840 fresh once-used words into the 14 plays that followed *Hamlet*, or in other words, each of these 14 plays averages over 200 words peculiar to itself. The number on the right side of the play named in the list below states how many of the above 2,840 words are to be found in that play.

<i>Tamburlaine I</i>	24	<i>Humorous Day's Mirth</i>	19
<i>The Spanish Tragedy</i>	20	<i>All Fools</i>	28
<i>The Troublesome Raigne</i>	21	<i>Bussy D'Ambois</i>	46
<i>Lochrine</i>	31	<i>Revenge of Bussy</i>	32
<i>Selimus</i>	28	<i>May Day</i>	38
<i>Edward III</i>	26	<i>The Widow's Tears</i>	41
<i>Hamlet Q1</i>	7	<i>Hamlet Q1 (Acts II.—V.)</i>	4

If Q1 is entirely derived from Q2, not one of these 2,840 words ought to be found in either version of *Hamlet* for the excellent reason that Shakespeare used each of these words once only in a play written after *Hamlet*. If four acts of Q1 are not by Shakespeare we ought to find not 4 but from 15 to 20 of these 2,840 words in these acts; the insignificant total of 4 is just as inexplicable as have been all the other results obtained on the above assumption. Professor Wilson's theory requires also, that the first act, being Shakespeare's, should not contain even one of these words, yet three are present. The only explanation of their presence is that the reporter interpolated them; why may he not have inserted the four other such words in the remaining acts of the play?

The various results obtained from a study of the vocabulary of Q1 combine to make any theory of partial or double revision untenable. Identity of vocabulary means either single authorship or plagiarism unlimited. No one will maintain that two playwrights can each write a play of twelve thousand words on the same subject and have vocabularies identical except for three hundred words. Essentially Q1, its corruption and imperfections being removed, is Shakespeare's. The first-sketch theory of the early critics has been abandoned; my own opinion is that what they called a "first sketch" is an abridged and garbled version made by a reporter who had acted in the official abridgment of Q2 prepared from the author's manuscript. I shall conclude this article with the statement that figures and results similar to those given above for Q1 have been obtained for the vocabularies of each of the other "bad" quartos of Shakespeare's plays.

NEW LIGHT ON EDWARD BENLOWES

BY CARL NIEMEYER

EDWARD BENLOWES, the poet, belonged to a family that had long been settled in Great Bardfield, Essex, although the family had originally come from Yorkshire. Their pedigree exists in several manuscripts and has been published,¹ although it has not been used by biographers of Benlowes. Anthony à Wood speaks of a "pedigree of 19 descents,"² but the founder of the family may be safely regarded as Christopher Benlowes, who married Elizabeth Rufford. Their son, William, was a sergeant-at-law and a person of considerable importance; he was made a sergeant at Michaelmas 1554,³ and on October 16, 1555, he and six others gave the sergeants' feast to celebrate their appointment.⁴ He was a member of Lincoln's Inn. His wife was Alienor, widow of John Berners of Finchingfield and daughter of Sir Edward Palmer of Ankaring in Sussex.⁵ On May 14, 1551, the impropriation of the Great Bardfield church was conveyed to the sergeant and his heirs forever. In 1556 he leased out the great tithes for twenty pounds a year, and settled half the sum yearly on the rector and his successors. With the other half he founded a chantry, confirmed by the Bishop of London and the Dean of St. Paul's on March 27, 1557.⁶ His will was dated July 4, 1571, and provided for the maintenance of a number of charities, chiefly gifts of money to the poor of the surrounding parishes.⁷ His legal work was not entirely forgotten either, some

¹ In *The Visitations of Essex*, ed. W. C. Metcalfe (1878), i. 347, from MS. Harl. 1541, f. 108B. See also in the Bodleian the following MSS.: Rawl B. 304, f. 54b, and Rawl. A. 313, f. 23.

² Anthony à Wood, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ed. Andrew Clark, ii. (Oxford, 1892), p. 361.

³ W. Dugdale, *Chronica Juridicalia* (1685), p. 165: "John Prideaux, . . . [and others] Will. Bendlows . . . made in 15. Mich. 1545. T.R. at Westm. and called 1. June before." 1545 is obviously a misprint for 1554.

⁴ W. Dugdale, *Origines Juridicales* (1671), pp. 128-30.

⁵ P. Morant, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Essex* (Chelmsford, 1816), ii. 521.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 259, 281, 290, 369, 388, 442, and 565.

of his case reports being utilized by succeeding jurists.¹ He died November 19, 1584.²

This was the poet's great-grandfather.³ His son, Edward's grandfather and another William, was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge, on November 10, 1558;⁴ he married Clare, the daughter of Thomas Smith of Cressing Temple.⁵ Clare's brother was William Smith, who died without heirs, and to whom Edward Benlowes wrote two Latin poems included in his exercise book now in the Bodleian Library.⁶ The two are very similar, and the first line of the second sounds as if it had been written to celebrate some event in William's life, perhaps a birthday. The first is headed "Auunculo suo longè observandissimo M^{ro} Gulielmo Smitho Armigero":

Semper inoblitâ repetam tua munera mente
Nec memori haec patiar pectore abire meo
INACHIS in vaccâ quondam conversa: parentem
Noverat, et palmis oscula chara dedit:
Sic fortuna mihi quanvis iam tristior esset
Oblitus potero non tamen esse tui
Dulcia amara prius fiunt et dextera laeva
Calthâq3 fragrantés vincet odore rosas
India nec flammâs, nec frigora Pontus habebit
Nec coelû stellâs, nec feret amnis aquas
Nec Pelagus pisces, néq3 solem maximus aether,
Clarâq3 se vetito proluet visa mari
Quam tua de nostris emigret cura medullis
Quâmq3 favor meriti possit abire tui.

The second is found on the last leaf of the volume:

Aurea pro strenâ nunc multi munera mittunt:
Carmina sunt tantum (Patruë) dona mihi.
Si Deus ora daret multis resonantia linguis:
Ingeniûmq3 capax iuditiumq3 sagax:
Æthereûsq3 mihi si condât carmina Phoebus
Non tua sat meritò dona referre queam
Et prius incipiet turres vitare columba:
Antra Leo, Taurus gramina, Navis aguas [sic]:
Ac calidas torpens flamas Salamandra pavebit
Effugiétq3 prius fertile Talpa solum:
Quam tua de nostris emigret Cura Medullis
Quâmq3 favor meritj possit abire tuj.⁷

¹ See in the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books Robert Keilwey's *Reports d'ascuns Cases . . . Ouesque les Reports d'ascuns Cases prises per Guillaume Dallison, et per Guillaume Bendloe, touchants la construction de divers Acts de Parliament par equité* (third edition, 1688).

² For further details see J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1922), i. 132.

³ Andrew Clark, "Edward Benlowes, of Brent Hall, Finchingfield," *The Essex Review*, xviii (1909), 13-23, states that the poet was a great grand-nephew to the first William, but he obviously simply erred. His article is based on the information in his own edition of *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ii. 360-62, where the relationship is correctly given.

⁴ *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 358, note.

⁵ For a pedigree of this family see *The Visitations of Essex*, i. 459.

⁶ Rawl. D 278.

⁷ The last two lines are written in a different ink.

The elder of William Benlowe's two sons was Andrew, who matriculated a pensioner from King's College at St. John's at Michaelmas, 1592, and was admitted at Lincoln's Inn on December 4, 1596.¹ He married Phillip (or perhaps Philippa, the name borne later by Edward's niece) Gage, daughter of Edward Gage of Bentley in Sussex.² They had three children: Edward (no doubt named for his maternal grandfather, since the name is new in the Benlowes family), Henry, and Clare, who married Thomas Peirce of Auson (Alvston upon Avon).

The date of Edward's birth is usually given as 1603, on the authority of Wood, who said he died "an. 1676, aged 73 years or more."³ But Wood also said he became a gentleman commoner at St. John's when he was "about 16 years of age," and the date of his admission was April 8, 1620.⁴ Accordingly 1604 is also a possible date.

Of his childhood and life at college nothing is known. After his college years he travelled abroad. Thomas Fuller in dedicating to him section six of *The History of the University of Cambridge* declared Benlowes had visited beyond the seas seven courts of princes:⁵

Edv. Benlossio Armigero, *Mecænati suo benevolo. Septem Principum Aulas transmarinas (ni malè memini) te perlustrâsse accepi. In quibus splendide vestes, dubiæ dapes, ingens famulitium, continuus strepitus, multa denique Confusio, quæ in Regum Hospitiis, Honoris ergò, Magnificèntia est nominanda.*

En tibi plures Musarum Aulas (sic oppositè Collegia dicuntur) in hâc Historiâ nostrâ descriptas. Esto tu æquissimus Arbiter (cùm utraq; tibi notissima) Aulicorum, an Academicorum vita sit beatior. Non dubito te Musicolarum placidam quietem, vestitum simplicem, vultum tenuem, fercula vacua, mentes plenas, phaleratis Palatinorum miseriis, ac eorum tolerabili vanitati prælaturum.

Præsertim Joannense Collegium dulcedine suâ te allecturum spero; cùm tibi olim Natale solum, ubi Literis fuisti innutritus, et cui Donaria non contemnenda dedisti, plura et preciosiora (ni fallor) daturus, si omnia justæ tuæ expectationi respondissent.

According to Wood, he returned from his travels "tinged with romanism," and it is quite possible that his family had been Catholic.

¹ Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, i. 132.

² *The Visitations of Essex*, i. 347. Here the name is written "Gage."

³ *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 359.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 358, note.

⁵ Thomas Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge* (1655), p. 89.

In 1632 Ralph Winterton dedicated to Benlowes his translation of Drexelius' considerations upon eternity, and wrote,¹

He [Drexelius] was commended unto me by a Traveller, a most religious and learned Gentleman (Be not angry with me, Mr. Benlowes, if I say, He was as like you as can be in every respect, for indeed he was ;) bred and brought up in the *Romish Religion*, and sent beyond seas to be confirmed in it, but yet brought home again by divine providence and restored to his *Mother the Church of England*, for the *Conversion*, I hope, of many, singled out of all his kindred to be a most *zealous Protestant*, born to good *Fortunes*, and yet not given to *Pleasures*, wedded to his *Books* and *Devotion*, spending what some call idle time in the best company for the edifying himself or others ; counting nothing good which he possesseth but onely that which he doth good withall ; taking more care to lay out his money for the good of others, then others in laying up money for themselves. To conclude, A Gentleman of whom I may most truly say, that his *Conversation is in heaven*, his *Discourse on things above*, and his *thoughts upon Eternity*.

It would seem from a passage in one of William Cole's manuscripts that Benlowes preferred Catholicism because he felt the need of some high final authority like the Pope.² Wood in his biography of Richard Crakanthorpe referred to Crakanthorpe's manuscript book *Popish falsifications . . .* (1607) :³ " This Book I saw at Oxon in the hands of Mr. *Edw. Benlowes* the Poet, who in his younger days was a Papist, or at least very Popishly affected, and in his elder Years a bitter enemy to that Party."

According to Clark, Benlowes was captain of a troop of horse in Essex in 1626 and again in 1637.⁴ The poet himself in the *Mantissa* to Richard Fenn's *De celeberrima & florentiss. Trinobantiados Augustæ Civ. Praetori Reg. Senatui Populoq;* (1637)

¹ *The Considerations Of Drexelius Upon Eternitie. Translated by Ralph Winterton Fellow of Kings Colledge in Cambridge* (1654), sigg. A4^v-A5^r. (The dedication is dated from King's College, June 1, 1632 ; it was reprinted by Egerton Brydges, *Restituta*, iii. [1815], pp. 45-46.)

² The passage is quoted by Brydges, *Restituta*, iii. 42 : " Amongst Dr. Sam. Ward's MS. papers there is an answer, *Ad quæsitâ D. Bendlosse*, which shews him (Bendlosse) to have been then a Papist : and his chief objection is taken from our want of a Judge of Controversies and divisions among ourselves. B."

³ *Athenæ Oxonienses* (1721), i. 491.

⁴ Clark, " Edward Benlowes," p. 14. (This article gives much new material about the poet, but since it is almost entirely innocent of footnotes, it is extremely difficult to check any of the statements. However, on this point Clark refers to his own article, " The Essex Territorial Force in 1608," *The Essex Review*, xvii. [1908], 98-105, which is based on an official letter-book of the deputy-lieutenant of Essex, discovered by Sir C. H. Firth. It is no doubt from here that he derived his information.)

referred to himself as "turmae equestris in com. Essex praefectus."¹ Samuel Butler in his account of Benlowes in the character of "a small poet," said:²

When he [Benlowes] was a Captain, he made all the Furniture of his Horse, from the Bit to the Crupper, in beaten Poetry, every Verse, being fitted to the Proportion of the Thing, with a moral Allusion of the Sense to the Thing; as the *Bridle of Moderation*, the *Saddle of Content*, and the *Crupper of Constancy*; so that the same Thing was both Epigram and Emblem, even as a Mule is both Horse and Ass.

Furthermore, there is extant in the British Museum a letter to Sir Thomas Barrington, endorsed "ffrom Cap^t Bendlowes octo[ber] ii^o: 1643."³ This letter, which must be by the poet,⁴ reveals him as a man of affairs unlike the impractical poet of tradition, and throws some light on the religion of his family:

Noble S^r

Were I confident of y^r being at Hatfield, I would haue personally waited there on y^u, to haue y^e favour frō y^u, to know when & where y^rself & y^e Comissioners next meete, for I am enformed by my Bardfield Tenants, y^t they were last munday forbidden at Dunmow to pay me their due rents, because it is conceived (though unproved) y^t my Mother is a papist, who never being legally convicted, & living in London, paying all parliamentary rates & taxes, & contributing nothing to y^e other side, I hope, my Mother comes not wthin y^e compasse of the Ordinance. S^r, no Tenants lease is made to her, shee hath no visible estate nor can they sweare shee hath other ioynture then my liberality. Half my rents thus sequestred for not my fault, & y^e other rents scarce to be had disable me (who haue payed all things for y^e whole estate hetherto) to discharge y^e remainder of y^e 20 part wherein I was rat^d beyond y^e ordinance. But (I feare) these things arise frō some personall differences between S^r M. Lumley and my self, wherein passion may overact. I beseech y^u, y^t at y^e next publike meeting I may reioyce in y^e fruition of y^r iust favour,
for w^{ch} I rest

Brenthall

Oct: 11 1643

y^r most obliged serv^t
Benlowes

Sir Thomas Barrington, to whom the letter is addressed, was a member of an important Essex family. He had succeeded to the

¹ I have not seen this book of Fenn's. This information is taken from the *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 358.

² Samuel Butler, *Characters and Passages from Notebooks*, ed. A. R. Waller (Cambridge, 1908), p. 53.

³ Egerton 2647, f. 312.

⁴ Dated from Brent Hall, the letter could be only by Edward or the brother Henry, of whom nothing is heard save the mention in the pedigree in *The Visitations of Essex*. Edward, as elder son, would have been the head of the family and the natural person to write such a communication.

baronetcy in 1628 at the death of his father ;¹ he sat for Colchester in the Long Parliament and was opposed to the Court. He died in 1644. Sir Martin Lumley, born in 1604, was a son of the Sir Martin who was once Lord Mayor of London and who died in 1634. The son was High Sheriff of Essex in 1639 and was made a baronet on January 8, 1641.² He was returned to Parliament the following month as knight of the shire, and represented Essex throughout the Long Parliament. Like Sir Thomas, he was opposed to the King and on the side of the Parliament. He was buried in October, 1651.³ Benlowes would have cause to be alarmed about his mother's religion before two such staunch parliamentarians as these. The letter is interesting too as showing the beginning of the financial troubles that were to grow more acute until the poet died of poverty.

But complete financial dissolution was not yet. *Theophila* was published in 1652, an expensive piece of book-making, for which Benlowes probably paid, and the generous poet may well have given away many copies. That now in the Widener collection in the Harvard College Library came from the collection of the Earl of Westmorland, and on the title-page the poet had written : "For y^e R^t Hoble y^e Earl of Westmorland &c.⁴ Author Esse sui hoc voluit Monumentũ & pignus Honoris. Octobr^{is} : 17 1653." One of the copies of *Theophila* in the Bodleian is also a presentation copy⁵ and contains on the title-page the same inscription, although without the name of Westmorland. Benlowes still controlled the living of Great Bardfield, and he was the patron of Samuel Hall, admitted to the living on March 9, 1656.⁶ Perhaps it was at this time that he caused to be decorated the chancel roof in the Great Bardfield church. The initials E.B. are apparently a part of the decoration.⁷

It is Wood who tells⁸ how (probably in 1657) Benlowes sold the

¹ See G. Alan Lowndes (editor), "The History of the Barrington Family," *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, ii. (1879), pp. 36-39.

² Morant, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Essex*, ii. 520.

³ C. Fell Smith, "Bardfield Great Lodge and the Lumleys," *The Essex Review*, ix. (1900), pp. 11-13.

⁴ Mildmay Fane, second earl, was himself a poet. His volume, *Otia Sacra*, had been published in 1648.

⁵ Fol. BS 144. Clark points out ("Edward Benlowes," p. 20) that this is among John Selden's books, and Benlowes may well have presented it to the jurist.

⁶ *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, xx. (1930), p. 201 ; and *ibid.*, vi. (1898), p. 132, where the date is March 19. Both accounts are from Lambeth MS. 996, p. 590.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vi. 190.

⁸ *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ii. 361-62.

family manor, Brent Hall, to dower his niece Philippa Benlowes, who must have been Henry's daughter, on her marriage to Walter Blount of Mapledurham, Oxfordshire. The buyer was Nathan Wright, Esq., of Cranham Hall, whose son Benjamin Wright, Esq., paid his ingress fine in 1659, and in 1668 sold the estate to Mark Guyon, Esq., of Great Maplestead.¹ Not only Brent Hall was sold; the nine hundred acres of "arable, meadow, pasture, and wood" included also, according to Morant, the manors of Justices, Hawkells, and a moiety of Cockfeilds. No doubt it was at this time too that the poet sold, again to Wright, the impropriation and advowson that had been in the family since the time of Sergeant Benlowes.² Benlowes had given his niece the money, assuming that he was thereby assuring himself of a home for life. Wood believed that his relatives neglected him, but Wood's editor, Clark, points out that Philippa died in 1667 and her husband in May, 1671, whereupon the estate passed to a cousin, Lister Blount,³ who apparently did not feel that the care of the poet was incumbent upon him.

In 1664 the poet was in Oxford in a debtor's prison,⁴ having bound himself for the payment of others' debts.⁵ Somehow he got out, but he drops from sight for a few years. The seven years before his death, in 1676, he lived in Oxford in poverty. He was not entirely without friends willing to interest themselves in his financial situation. On February 28, 1675, Dr. Thomas Barlow, head of Queen's College,⁶ wrote to Sir Joseph Williamson: ⁷

The opportunity I have to send by so good a hand gives you the trouble of this. I desired Dr. Halton ⁸ to propose to you the business about

¹ Morant, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Essex*, ii. 368. (An ambiguous reference immediately preceding suggests that Walter and Philippa already had some interest in these estates: "In February 1654 [probably 1655], a fine passed between Robert Abdy and William Megg, Esquires, plaintiffs, and Edward Bendlows, Walter Blount, Esquires, and Philippa Bendlows, deforc'. [sic] of the manors of Brent-hall, Justices, Hawkells, Priors Fenns, Cockfeilds, and rectory of Great Bardfield.")

² *Ibid.*, p. 521.

³ *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ii. 362, note. (Wood's account of the sum of money given by Edward to his niece varies; once he says seven thousand pounds and on another occasion three thousand.)

⁴ Clark, "Edward Benlowes," p. 14. (I can find no authority for the date 1664. Wood [*The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ii. 360 and 362], however, says clearly that Benlowes lived in Oxford seven years before his death, and this would mean that he came there in about 1669.)

⁵ *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 358.

⁶ Only a short time after the letter was written Barlow was made Bishop of Lincoln.

⁷ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1673-1675 (1904), p. 610.

⁸ Timothy Halton, B.D., fellow of Queen's.

Mr. Benlowes' bonds, and he tells me how willingly you embraced it, and notwithstanding your great and public businesses, undertook the trouble, and I hope by your prudence and authority that money, which is certainly and justly due to the poor gentleman, may be recovered, which will be a benefit to the College and an act of great charity to him.

To Williamson the poet was destined to be indebted again. In May, 1676, to thank him for a gift of five pounds Benlowes sent him a Latin couplet, still preserved in the Public Record Office : ¹

Quinq; Libras à Te, Vir Præclariss^{mo}, cæpi :

Ex animo, fœlix sis sine Fine precor.

Servus tuus humillimus
Benlosius.

Probably in the same year, and no doubt in reference to the same gift, John Fell, Bishop of Oxford, himself wrote to Williamson : ²

Mr. Benlowes, whom I take to be the most helpless creature in the world, was exceedingly surprised at the unexpected relief you sent him and confessed that 4s. was then his whole stock, yet seems as little disturbed as if he were master of the Indies. Probably you may have an heroical epistle, for poetry sticks as close to him now he is well nigh fourscore, as his poverty does. To be a poor knight of Windsor would be a very acceptable as well as necessary provision for him, for, though one in his condition ought not to be a chooser, I perceive he has no kindness for London and had rather hazard starving in the country than live there.

One trusts that Williamson's hopes were not too much dashed when the heroical epistle optimistically promised by Dr. Fell shrank to a Latin couplet, impeccable though the sentiments of the couplet may be.

Apparently before the next vacancy occurred among the poor knights Benlowes was dead, for we do not hear of his belonging to the order founded by Edward III in 1348.³ He was certainly eligible for membership. One of the rules of the order as established by Queen Elizabeth was that the members be "Gentlemen brought to necessity, such as have spent their times in the service of the Wars, Garrisons, or other service of the Prince, having but

¹ S.P. 29/381/203.

² CSP, Dom., 1678 (1913), p. 607. (Bishop Fell's letter the editor dates, with a query, 1676.)

³ For an account of the poor knights see N. H. Nicolas, *History of the Orders of Knighthoods of the British Empire* (1842), ii. 471-83; for the order of Edward III founding the poor knights, dated August 6, 1348, see *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward III, 1348-1350* (1905), p. 144.

little or nothing whereupon to live.”¹ That Benlowes was suggested as a possible poor knight is, then, clear indication of his poverty; another rule of the order was that none might continue to be a member should he acquire in “either lands or Rents” an income of twenty pounds a year or more.² We may be permitted to regret that the poet never had the pleasure of wearing the livery of the order (“one gown of 4 yards of the Colour of Red, and a Mantle of Blue, or Purple Cloth, of five yards, at six shillings eight pence the yard”),³ for his must have been an eye delighted by colour; and we may be sure that he would have observed the rule of the order not to “haunt the Town, the Alehouses, the Taverns, nor call any Woman into [his] Lodgings, without it be upon a reasonable cause, and that with the License of the *Dean* or his *Deputy*.”⁴

The end came late in 1676. He died at the house of Nicholas Maund, an apothecary in St. Mary's parish, on Monday, December 18, at eight o'clock in the evening.⁵ The cold weather proved fatal to one who lacked, as Wood put it, “conveniences, that is, cloths, fewell, and warme things to refresh his body.” He was buried in St. Mary's church, “his head near to the entrance of the vestry where the Drs. put on their robes.” Although the bishop, who, as we saw, had done Benlowes good service, did not attend the funeral, the hearse, on which were emblazoned the poet's arms, was attended by “certaine Drs. . . . besides severall masters and others.”⁶ Oxford scholars contributed money for his burial, one John Mill, or Mills, of Queen's contributing forty shillings.⁷

Benlowes had many friends among the poets, and from one or two dedications it appears that he encouraged poets to print their works. Phineas Fletcher in dedicating *The Purple Island* to him wrote,⁸ “In letting them [his poems] abroad I desire onely to testifie, how much I preferre your desires before mine own, and how much I owe to *You* more then any other.” Francis Quarles in his epistle to Benlowes prefixed to the *Emblemes* of 1635 declared,⁹ “My deare

¹ Elias Ashmole, *The Institutions, Lawes and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1693), p. 162.

² *Ibid.*, p. 159.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood*, ii. 360, 362.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 361.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Phineas Fletcher, *The Purple Island* (1633), sig. ¶ 3^v.

⁹ Francis Quarles, *Emblemes* (1635), sig. A2^r.

Friende, You have put the Theorboe into my hand ; and I have played : You gave the Musitian the first encouragement ; the Musicke returns to you for Patronage." Similarly Alexander Ross, who published in 1645 *Medicus Medicatus : Or The Physician Cured, By A Lenitive Or Gentle Potion : With some Animadversions upon Sir Kenelm Digbie's Observations on Religio Medici* ; an epistle to Benlowes tells us that the book was published to "satisfie your desire" and concludes :¹ "Therefore accept these sudden and extemporary Animadversions, so earnestly desired by you, as a testimony of his service and love to you, who will alwaies be found Your servant to command." Clement Paman² wrote Benlowes a complimentary letter³ perhaps before the publication of *Theophila*, in which after a discourse upon the subject of devotion he writes :⁴ "All my pleasure is, yt I haue obeyed you, & somewhat rays'd my owne heart wth these imaginations." Paman continues, speaking of "Sacrata," by which he means *Theophila* :⁵

She is as y^u say in y^e bud yett, And buds, like her, weare their sweetnes wrapt vp in Modesty, and haue theire beauties cover'd by Nature wth a veile : But w^a she shall be full blown, I doubt not but she will make good y^e vertues she is descended of, both by Father and Mother : wth both whose goodnes I am so well acquainted y^t I haue wisht Sacrata perfect enough w^a I haue wished her like y^m.

These lines suggest that the letter was written before the poem was printed and that it had circulated in manuscript among the author's friends ; but unfortunately the letter is undated and the language is too vague for one to be certain.

Other poets admired *Theophila*, as the commendatory poems in the 1652 edition prove. James Howell, the author of the *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae*, although his poem is not printed with *Theophila*, wrote one that is included in his book of verses edited by Payne Fisher in 1663.⁶ Fisher himself wrote a commendatory poem in Latin,

¹ Alexander Ross, *Medicus Medicatus* (1645), sig. A4^v.

² Vicar of Thatcham, Berkshire, from 1648 to 1653, and prebendary of St. Patrick's, Dublin, 1661-1663. See Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, iii. 302 ; S. Barfield, *Thatcham, Berks. and its Manors* (1901), i. 140-44 ; and CSP, Dom., 1660-1661 (1860), p. 197.

³ In the Bodleian Library, MS. Rawl D 945, ff. 29-32.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 32^r.

⁵ Jeremy Collier's commendatory poem to *Theophila* is entitled *A Friend's Echo, to his Fancy Upon Sacrata* (*Minor Caroline Poets*, ed. G. Saintsbury, i. [Oxford, 1905], 323-24).

⁶ *Poems On several Choice and Various Subjects. Occasionally Composed By An Eminent Author* (1663), pp. 123-24. (The poem, entitled *Upon Mr. Benlowes Divine Theophila*, is fourteen lines long and is written in couplets.)

entitled *In celeberrimam Theophilam, feliciter elucubratam*, which was printed with *Theophila*,¹ signed P.F., of whom Saintsbury said he knew nothing.² Obviously, however, the author is Fisher; not only did Wood mention him as Benlowes' friend,³ but another version of the poem appears in the volumes called *Marston-Moor: Sive De Obsidione Prælioque Eboracensi Carmen; Cum Quibusdam Miscellaneis Operâ Studioque Pagani Piscatoris Elucubratis* (1650), which, as the pseudonym *Paganus Piscator* indicates, is by Payne Fisher.⁴ Here it is called *In Eruditissimi Ornatissimique Viri Dⁿⁱ Benlosii Theophilam; Obiterque De Nonnullis Opusculis ab Ipso Elucubratis*. As published with *Theophila* in 1652 the poem is thirty-one lines long; the *Marston-Moor* version is fifty-four lines long. The 1652 version omits the first ten lines, lines 19 to 24 (for which one new line is substituted), lines 28 to 29, line 48, and lines 52 to 54. There are also minor verbal changes involving no more than a word or two. That this poem was first published in *Marston-Moor* in 1650⁵ is indication that *Theophila* was known to Benlowes' friends at least two years before it was put into print. This seems to be borne out too by the passage already quoted from Clement Paman's letter. Fisher and Benlowes seem to have been on excellent terms. The first of the seven commendatory poems in *Marston-Moor* is signed "E. Benlosius"; and later in the book⁶ a note to the reader in prose informs him that the expense of publication was borne by Benlowes, "Armigeri, Literarum Propugnatoris acerrimi, nec non Musarum Munificentissimi Meccenatis."

¹ *Minor Caroline Poets*, i. 333.

² *Ibid.*, p. 334.

³ *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii. 358.

⁴ Sigg. L4^r-M^r. (Sig. L contains a title-page to the second half of the book: *Miscellanea quædam ejusdem autoris. Quibus etiam accessit, Threnodia In Memoriam Ferd. Fisheri Turmi Equestris Præfecti. A Domino Petro de Cardonnel Decantata*. This must, of course, be the P. de Cardonnel whose Latin verses, *In Sanctos Theophilæ Amores*, are among the commendatory poems in *Theophila*. He is not, however, as Saintsbury surmises [*Minor Caroline Poets*, i. 334, note], the father of Adam de Cardonnel, secretary to the duke of Marlborough. The *D.N.B.* article on Adam shows that Peter was the uncle of the secretary.)

⁵ This 1650 version may also be found in *Piscatoris Poemata* (1656)—a collection of Fisher's poems—sigg. B2^r and ^v and C of the fourth group of signatures.

⁶ *Marston-Moor*, sig. a4^v.

SOME EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PHONETIC SPELLINGS

By WILLIAM MATTHEWS

IN his *History of Modern Colloquial English*, 1920, etc., Professor H. C. Wyld firmly established the "occasional" spelling as the most reliable evidence upon the pronunciation of English in the earlier periods of the language. Phonetic misspellings, by their very nature, are free from the consideration which hampers so much of the evidence of the earlier phoneticians, that is, the correct spelling. In consequence, Professor Wyld was able to trace in these spellings many types of pronunciation which were neglected by the phoneticians and to show that numerous pronunciations which they describe as vulgar were in fact used by good speakers. The chief limitation of the method of occasional spellings is, of course, that it is only available for periods when bad spelling was not considered a grave defect in the writer's education. Professor Wyld found ample material for his study in the phonetic spellings of documents written in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, but he had practically no material of this kind after the seventeenth century, and even for the latter part of the seventeenth century he relied principally upon only two sets of documents, the third and fourth volumes of the *Verney Memoirs*, and the two-volume edition of the *Wentworth Papers*. In the *Wentworth Papers*, however, are a number of letters, written chiefly by the elder Lady Wentworth, by her son Peter, the Equerry, and by her daughter-in-law, Lady Strafford, which relate to the first third of the eighteenth century. Professor Wyld, therefore, stressed the importance of these letters, which, he states, "are of great value for the study of eighteenth-century English." Their chief value was to show the continued use in the early part of the eighteenth century of the seventeenth-century types of pronunciation, which were later dropped from standard English.

After an extensive search through the published collections of eighteenth-century correspondence, and the large collections of

unpublished eighteenth-century letters in the British Museum, I have found several large groups of documents which are extremely valuable in supplementing the evidence found by Professor Wyld in the *Wentworth Papers*. These documents are :

Verney Letters of the Eighteenth Century, first published in 1930. Two volumes. They are referred to in this study as V1 and V2 respectively.

Hatton-Finch Papers : Family Correspondence. Vol. vi., 1700-30. British Museum Additional MS. 29576. Referred to as Hn.

Ellis Papers : Correspondence of the Family of Ellis. Vols. iii-vii., 1706-21. B.M. Add. MSS. 28932-36. Referred to as E3, E4, E5, E6, E7.

Strafford Papers :

Letters from Anne, Countess of Strafford to her husband, 1711-36. B.M. Add. MS. 22226. Referred to as S1.

Letters from Isabella, Lady Wentworth, 1707-29. B.M. Add. MS. 22225. Referred to as S2.

Letters from Peter Wentworth and his wife, Juliana, 1707-37. B.M. Add. MS. 22227. Referred to as S3.

Miscellaneous Family Correspondence. Two volumes. 1707-38. B.M. Add. MSS. 22228-9. Referred to as S4 and S5.

Hardwicke Papers, Vol. xi., 1704-64. B.M. Add. MS. 35359. Referred to as Hke.

Caryll Correspondence : Vol. i., 1712-18 ; vol. ii., 1719-38. B.M. Add. MSS. 28227-8. Referred to as C1 and C2 respectively.

Apart from those letters in the *Strafford Papers* which were selected for publication in the two-volume edition of the *Wentworth Papers*, these documents have not, so far as I am aware, been previously used for philological study.

The *Verney Letters* continue the correspondence of the Verney family which was published in the four volumes of the *Verney Memoirs* from 1696 to the end of the eighteenth century. The ladies (and a few of the gentlemen) whose letters occupy these two volumes preserved that thorough disregard for conventional spelling which characterized the writers of the earlier Verney letters. The majority of the spellings which proved interesting for this study were written in the years 1700-17, but a few valuable forms occur

as late as 1748. The Verney family had long been settled at Claydon, on the border of Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. A large number of the family alliances of the Verneys were with members of other old Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire families, and as the Verney ladies whose letters have proved most prolific in occasional spellings lived most of their time in the country, it is safe to assume that any provincialisms reflected in the spellings of these documents were forms used in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. Lady Cary Gardiner and Mrs. Elizabeth Adams, the daughters of Sir Edmund Verney, provide most of the phonetic spellings in these letters; but many others may be found in the letters of two other generations of Verney ladies, in those of Lady Elizabeth Verney and her daughters Elizabeth, Mrs. Mary Lovett, and Lady Margaret Cave, and various members of the allied Denton and Stewkley families.

The *Strafford Papers* provided the next largest group of spellings. The volume of letters written by Anne, the wife of Thomas Wentworth, Baron Raby and third Earl of Strafford, relate principally to the years 1711-12, but some interesting forms occur in letters dated 1724-36. Although the Wentworths were a Yorkshire family, the countess was from Buckinghamshire, being the daughter of Sir Henry Johnson of Bradenham, Bucks. For the purposes of this paper, the most valuable volume in the *Strafford Papers*, however, is that composed of the letters of Lady Isabella Wentworth (d. 1733), the wife of Sir William Wentworth and the mother-in-law of the Countess Anne. Most of the letters were written in the years 1707-14. Lady Isabella was the daughter of Sir Allen Apsley, treasurer of the household to James, Duke of York. After her marriage to Sir William Wentworth she lived at his estate at Ashby Puerorum, Lincolnshire, at the family seat which he inherited at Northgate Head, Wakefield, and also in London. The remaining letters utilized in this collection are principally those of Peter, the second son of Lady Isabella, and of his wife Juliana, forming one volume, and two volumes of miscellaneous correspondence, chiefly from Lady Isabella's daughters, Elizabeth, Frances Arabella (wife of Lord Bellew of Ireland), Anne (wife of James Donellan of Ireland), and Isabel (wife of Francis Arundel of Stoke Bruerne, Northants). It is difficult to imagine that the members of the Wentworth family, who were of the aristocracy—Lady Isabella had been a Lady of the Bedchamber at the Court of James II and her son Peter an equerry—

would have used provincialisms, but if they were at all influenced by dialect pronunciations, it was probably by the dialects of Lincolnshire and Yorkshire.

The volume of *Hatton-Finch Papers* is interesting chiefly for the letters of Mary and Elizabeth, the sisters of Sir Christopher Hatton, first Viscount Hatton. The Hattons were a Northamptonshire family living at Kirkby. The phonetic spellings scattered throughout five volumes of the *Ellis Papers* were written mainly during the years 1700-21 by Diana, wife of Welbore Ellis, Bishop of Meath, and by Margaret Ellis. The Ellis family had long been settled at Kiddall Hall, Yorkshire, but Diana Ellis was the daughter of Sir William Briscoe of Boughton, Northants. The *Hardwicke Papers* are valuable for the reason that they provide many late spellings, written between 1722 and 1744, the writers being Lady Elizabeth Yorke, mother of the first Earl of Hardwicke and daughter of Richard Gibbon of Dover, and of her daughters Mary Jones and Elizabeth Billingsley. As the Yorke family had been settled at Dover since the beginning of the seventeenth century, these spellings may be taken as representing the contemporary accepted English spoken in Kent. The remaining letters used are those in one volume of the *Caryll Correspondence*, the writers being Mary Petre, Lady Catherine Petre, Benedicta Fleetwood, M. Carrington, Catherine Lacy, and John Lacy. According to the *D.N.B.*, the Carylls and Petres were prominent Catholic families, the former of West Harting in Sussex and the latter of Essex.

The great majority of the phonetic spellings in all these documents were written in the years 1700-20, but as there are a fairly large number in the letters written between 1720 and 1748, and as the writers were members of good middle-class or upper-class families, it is fairly safe to rely upon them as guides to the pronunciation of good speakers in the first third of the eighteenth century.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of these spellings is the light they throw upon the problem of standard English. Standard English as we know it to-day is obviously an artificial type of pronunciation which, while it provides an absolute standard for every word, is arbitrarily inconsistent in the allocation of different pronunciations to words of the same type. Instances of this inconsistency which immediately suggest themselves are: *clerk*, *Derby*, *Hertford* as compared with *learn*, *early*, *mercy*; *break*, *great* as

compared with *weak*, *heat* ; *broad* as compared with *road* ; *wag*, *swam* as compared with *want*, *swan* ; and *laughter* as compared with *slaughter*. In a few cases there is even still a divergency of pronunciation of the same words, as with the two pronunciations of *launch*, *staunch*, and of *frost*, *off*, etc. Many hundreds of other such inconsistencies and many more which are obscured by the spelling could be adduced. This arbitrary Standard pronunciation seems to have been fairly well settled by the end of the eighteenth century, if we may judge by the comparative agreement between such writers as Elphinston, Walker, Kenrick, Johnston, and Batchelor, and by the types of pronunciation which are used as vulgarisms by the novelists of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

In the seventeenth century, phonetic spellings show quite clearly that although there was a type of pronunciation which was used by good speakers throughout the country, that type of pronunciation did not impose a single standard. The phonetic spellings brought forward by Professor Wyld, and many others which I have found in documents other than those which he examined, make it abundantly clear that many groups of words were then pronounced in two or more radically different ways. At the end of the eighteenth century, the lexicographers and phoneticians agree in describing many of these variants as vulgar, and a little later they are used by Pierce Egan, Dickens, and Thackeray to typify the vulgar speech of London. It seems evident, therefore, that the chief function of the eighteenth century in the history of English was the development of an absolute standard of pronunciation. Among the variants used in the seventeenth century are almost all the pronunciations which are now used in standard, and although the eighteenth century did not completely rid itself of all the other variants, it was successful in relegating most of them to vulgar speech.

The eighteenth-century phonetic spellings which I have collected for this study show clearly that in the first third of the eighteenth century the earlier varying pronunciations still existed in good speech. Many groups of words were pronounced in two or three different ways, and although a number of the pronunciations reflected in seventeenth-century spellings do not appear in these later spellings, the speech of the period was essentially the same as that which Professor Wyld has proved to have existed in the seventeenth century. To illustrate this fact, I may here anticipate some later

sections by quoting a few spellings which graphically reveal a few of the chief divergencies :

Present-day [i:]. *lave* (leave), *say* (sea), *spake* (speak), *plase* (please) ; but also *spick* (speak), *pleesed*, *live* (leave), *leeve* ; etc.

Present-day [e]. *fatch* (fetch), *yallow* (yellow), *alltogather*, *frandes* (friends), *wather* (whether) ; but also, *frinds*, *wither* (whether), *frish* ; etc.

Present-day [æ:] *devirsions*, *sirved*, *disirues*, *pirson*, *sirtaine* ; but also *divartion*, *sarve*, *desarve*, *parson*, *sartain*.

These and many similar spellings occur frequently in the following sections. There are also many others which point to the use of pronunciations which in the latter part of the eighteenth century and in the nineteenth century were considered typical London vulgarisms. Among these forms are :

[e] for [i]. *sperrit* (spirit), *sence* (since), *tell* (till), *sett* (sit).

[e] for [æ]. *ketch* (catch), *gether* (gather), *telloe* (tallow), *velew* (value).

[e] for [ʌ]. *Sheten* (shutting), *jest* (just), *shet* (shut) ; and also *Shittlecock*.

owl for *ol*. *rowler* (roller), *ould* (old), *could* (cold) *tould* (told), *sould* (sold) ; etc.

[ai] for [ɔi]. *Implyment*, *distryed*, *fyne*, *disapinted* ; etc.

-ing for *-en*. *sudding* (sudden), *chickings*, *garding*, *serting* (certain) ; etc.

And also such forms as *Crownation* (coronation), *know'd* (knew), *ketcht* (caught) ; and *drownded* (drowned).

It is a striking commentary upon the orthoepists of the seventeenth century that they rarely even mention these variant pronunciations. Although the orthoepists do not always quite agree in the pronunciations they describe, they are united in neglecting to acknowledge the existence of more than one pronunciation of any word. Occasionally a writer will mention a few variant pronunciations and describe them as vulgar. The most interesting of such "vulgarisms" are those given in Cooper's *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, 1685, and the *Writing Scholar's Companion*, 1695, the latter adopting and making additions to Cooper's list. I am inclined to think that most of these vulgarisms are intended to refer to pronunciations used in London. Certainly the anonymous writer of the *Writing Scholar's Companion* seems to have been a Londoner,

for on p. 12 he refers to the pronunciation of "London, where to avoid a broad clownish speaking, we are too apt to run into the contrary Extream of an affected way of speaking perhaps too fine." Not only do these lists seem to be too unsystematic to refer to provincial dialect, but the *Writing Scholar's Companion* appears to regard only one of its vulgarisms as provincial, and that only in origin, namely: "(sh) for (s) before (u) after the West-Country dialect; as shure, for sure: shugar, for sugar, &c." Yet this pronunciation was used by many educated people in these words, *sure, sugar, closure, measure*, and also in the word *such*, as the spellings on p. 50 clearly show. Similarly, many of the other vulgarisms in the *Writing Scholar's Companion* are shown by the spellings I have collected to have been commonly used by good speakers. Among them are: *fut* (foot), *git* (get), *hundurd* (hundred), *mought* (might), *shet* (shut), *wun* (one), *sez* (says), *sarvice* (service), *thare* (their, there); and although the other forms in the lists of both Cooper and the *Writing Scholar's Companion* do not happen to occur among the eighteenth-century occasional spellings, they may be found in letters written in the latter part of the seventeenth century, e.g. *ax* (ask), *Chorles* (Charles), *bushop* (bishop), *howsomever*, *hild* (held), *han-kercher*, *quawm* (qualm), *stomp* (stamp), *wull* (will), and *yerb* (herb). I believe that the explanation of this apparent contradiction is that the condemned pronunciations were used both in the contemporary vulgar speech (probably of London) and also by many good speakers, although not by those who were modelling their pronunciation upon spelling. In a similar fashion at the present time, such spellings as *wot* (what) *carnt* (can't), *arsk* (ask), *cauf* (cough) are often used as London vulgarisms, although the pronunciations which they are intended to indicate are in fact also used by good speakers. Until recent times phoneticians have felt it incumbent upon them to describe correct usages rather than merely to record the pronunciations used by their contemporaries. During the eighteenth century this attitude intensified, and, as has already been stated, many of the pronunciations which were used by good speakers at the beginning of the century were characterized as vulgar.

One might be inclined to attribute the discrepancy between the orthoepists and the phonetic spellings to the influence of regional dialects upon the letter-writers (especially as most of them were ladies who spent a large part of their time in their country homes),

but this view is improbable. The account of the principal writers which has already been given shows that they were brought up or lived for long periods in many widely separated parts of the country. The Verneys were a Buckinghamshire family, the Hattons of Northamptonshire, the Wentworths of Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, and the Yorkes of Kent; while many of the ladies who married into some of the families came from other districts. Yet the phonetic spellings are remarkably similar in all the documents: the same variations, although unacknowledged by the orthoepists, are indicated in spellings from many parts of the country. This is plainly shown by the fact that each group of documents contributes one or more forms to almost every type of pronunciation discussed in the following sections. A further fact which supports the view that these variants are not dialect peculiarities is that many of them are indicated in the rhymes of contemporary poetry. It is a noticeable feature of seventeenth-century rhymes that they are often based upon dual pronunciations, and that many of them are based upon pronunciations not recognized by the orthoepists. The following rhymes from Dryden which illustrate this fact may be taken as fairly characteristic of a multitude of seventeenth-century rhymes which I have examined. They are taken from the Globe edition of 1894: the reference numbers are to the pages of that edition.

M.E. [ɛ:] : nature feature 368, pains scenes means 479, way sea 509, congeal hail 536 : these turn on [ɛ:] but the second type, [i:] is used in free sea 174, begin scene 485, thick speak 612, etc.
ou, from M.E. ū : pursued disallowed 242, use house 397, house rendezvous 412, soon town 599; o'er power 620, hour power 621.

short e and short i : given Heaven 531, beget it 31, civil Devil 107, Prince offence 531, yet wit 633.

short o : follow wallow 431, fop up 448, addle noddle 467, flung strong 546.

shortening of u from M.E. ū : pursued good 157, blood mud 615, understood blood 617, blood good 619.

or before a consonant : returned mourned 172, affords birds 275, born morn turn 287, adorn return 371.

shew, show : conclude shewed 6, show go 11, foreshew you 23.

heard : heard prepared 549, squared heard 607; heard reward 531, heard yard 576.

Lastly, there is one contemporary orthoepist who does acknowledge the existence of a variety of pronunciations in the speech of his time, namely, Dr. John Jones, the author of the *Practical Phonography*, 1701. This orthoepist's method is one of question and answer, adopting the formula: "When is the sound of . . . written . . . ?" and then answering his question with examples. Very frequently he adds the information: "when it may also be sounded. . . ." For the main part his first pronunciations are those described by the contemporary orthoepists, but the alternatives are very often the pronunciations indicated by the phonetic spellings quoted in the following pages. Among the variant pronunciations indicated by Jones which are the same as or similar to pronunciations indicated by the spellings I have quoted are:

e pronounced i: Englefield, Jenkin, friend.

e pronounced a: rencounter, rendezvous, eleven, yellow.

au pronounced a: daunt, flaunt, haunt, jaunt, taunt, etc.

p pronounced b: baptism, capable, deputy, Jupiter, etc.

t pronounced d: Hatton, passport, holt.

q pronounced g: burlesque, risque, trafique.

Omission of t, d: Beaumont, distinct, pageant, drift, lift, fund, Ormond, etc.

Addition of t: once pronounced wanst.

th pronounced t, d: author, anthem, Catherine, Camarthen, fathom, etc.

gh pronounced f: "by some" in daughter, naught, taught, bought, etc., and as *th* in drought, sigh.

Non-pronunciation of [w]: swore, sworn, swollen: banquet, language, inward, somewhat, etc., and also initially in woof, wood, wool, wonder, work, worth, etc.

Metathesis of r: apron, caldron, citron, hundred, etc.

Su pronounced shu: leisure, measure, pleasure, treasure.

Non-pronunciation of n: Ilminster, Westminster, furmenty, etc.

Non-pronunciation of f, v: bailiff, handkerchief, devil, Liverpool, etc.

Non-pronunciation of y: yes, yesterday, year, yeast, yeeld, etc., and a multitude of other variations which do not happen to occur in the phonetic spellings which I have quoted, but which may be paralleled in similar seventeenth-century forms.

Professor Ekwall, who edited Jones's book, attributes a great many

of these variants to south-western influence upon Jones, who was born and lived a great part of the latter period of his life in Wales. But there is actually little justification for Professor Ekwall's view. It is true that many of these pronunciations now occur in the south-western dialects, but they are by no means exclusively south-western. Nor is there anything in Jones's book or even in his life to support such a view. The book, so far as I am aware, never suggests that the alternatives are regional pronunciations; for while a few pronunciations are definitely described as the usage of particular districts, the majority of the variations are given without any such comment. Nor is there any valid reason to think that Jones himself spoke a south-western modification of English: he was a fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, and after working for some time at Windsor, became Chancellor of the diocese of Llandaff.

The confirmation of rhymes—for Dryden's rhymes are supported by a great number of rhymes in other poets—and the parallelism between Jones's alternative pronunciations and the phonetic spellings written by members of the upper classes seem to establish with certainty that the great majority of these variant pronunciations are not regional but were used by many good speakers throughout the country. At an earlier period many of the forms may have been more characteristic of various districts, but in the eighteenth century they were widely diffused. I would suggest two factors which may have contributed to this diversity of pronunciation. In the first place, the class of "good speakers" was sufficiently closely knit for new pronunciations to circulate freely, but not sufficiently so for individual types of pronunciation to gain an easy mastery over others. The result was that old pronunciations were a long time dying, and some of them co-existed with more modern forms for two or more generations. There is clear evidence that many present-day pronunciations existed for over a century before they became generally used. Other pronunciations were matters of fashion and were adopted by some people and not by others (for example, short *a* for short *o*). I believe that London was the principal channel through which new pronunciations spread. In the second place, the movement towards an absolute standard of pronunciation which is shown by the single pronunciations recognized by seventeenth-century orthoepists did not gain its full strength until the second half of the eighteenth century. In that period Dr. Johnson and such writers of pronouncing dictionaries

as Walker, Sheridan, Kenrick, Johnston fostered the conception of "correct" pronunciation and established spelling as the standard by which pronunciation should be judged. The pronouncing dictionaries also succeeded in attaching the label of vulgarity to many pronunciations which were formerly used by good speakers, with the ultimate result that a great many pronunciations found in the phonetic spellings of the eighteenth century later appear in Dickens and Thackeray as characteristic Cockneyisms.

In the following paragraphs I have quoted only from letters written in the eighteenth century and I have added the date after every form written later than 1720. The phonetic symbols used are those of the International Phonetic Association, and the paragraphs dealing with vowels follow that Association's numbering of the vowels in present-day standard English.

Present-day [i:]. Even in the eighteenth century a distinction was sometimes preserved between the vowels which had developed from M.E. [e:] and M.E. [ɛ:]. It is generally agreed that the former vowel was raised to its present value of [i:] in the fifteenth century, and certainly its normal spelling *ee* is used in occasional spellings to represent [i:]. The same vowel was also often used, even early in the seventeenth century, in words which contained M.E. [ɛ:]. This is shown by the substitution of *ee* for the normal spelling *ea*, which represents an original M.E. [ɛ:], and also by the substitution of *i*, which equates the vowel with that of "short i" in *bit*, *him*, etc. The pronunciation of the present vowel [i:] is therefore represented by the following spellings: *beleeve* V1.160, *reeding* Hn.288, *Tee* (tea) E6.281, *Leest* S2.2, *Leeve* S2.11^v, *creecture* S2.12^v, *treets* S2.16^v, *cheepe* S2.18, *meenist* S2.18, *pleesed* S2.20, *deel* S2.46, *dreem* S2.70^v, *meet* (meat 1726) S2.496, *feesting* S2.86, *creems* S2.102^v, *reeson* (1729) Hke.177; *grived* V1.73, *prists* V1.74, *wick* (week) V1.74, *spick* (speak) V1.309, *Bigles* (beagles) V1.140, *chif* V1.103, *belives* V1.106, *live* (leave 1748) V2.236, *Istyme* Hn.29, *Reciued* E3.61, *agriable* C1.213, *betwine* C1.179.

On the other hand, a number of spellings equate the vowel in some words which contained M.E. [ɛ:] with the sound of *ai* or "long a," which in the eighteenth century were pronounced in much the same way as they are now, although they may have been monophthongs, that is, either [ei] or [e:]. The spellings noted are: *lave* (leave) V1.399, *spaks* (speaks) V1.124, *say* (sea) V1.107, *spake* E4.140, E7.186 (1721), *plased* (pleased 1733) S4.170, *plasd* C1.460,

plase (1722) Hke.34, *Incrase* (1726) Hke. 121, *Emadately* (1735) S1.438^v, *percaue* C1.212, *Plade* (plead) C1.470, *raisonable* C1.208^v, *spake* C1.318.

A comparison of these lists will show that in the eighteenth century, M.E. [e:] was pronounced as [i:], but that there was a dual pronunciation of M.E. [ε:] either [i:] or [e:], [ei]. This dual form is shown in *leave*, *please*, *reason*, *believe*, *speak*, and in all probability it existed in other words of the same type.

Present-day [i]. Except where the ordinary spelling is anomalous, the normal spelling for [i] is reproduced in these spellings. The following substitutions of *i* for anomalous spellings reveal the same pronunciations as we now use: *bissey* V1.201, *bisnes* V1.204, *Inglad* V1.266, *briches* V1.173, *wimen's* V1.107, *Inglish* Hn.242, *prity* Hn.263^v.

There are, however, a great many spellings which replace normal *i* by *e*; among these forms are: *Cevelyty* V1.73, *lenning* V1.78, *hether* V1.386, *Thether* V1.313, *Leverys* V1.173, *Senc* (since) V1.160, *cevelly* V1.136, *openion* V1.113, *Beling* (Billing) V1.107, *cestron* (cistern) V1.379, *shellings* V2.42, *speritts* (1721) V2.85, *Cevellytys* V2.165, *atrebute* Hn.36, *deligence* Hn.55^v, *restrection* Hn.116, *Sence* Hn.286, *sperrit* E3.55, *Sester* E3.386, *delever* E3.441, *slepe* (slip) E3.441, *conseder* E3.441, *sett* (sit) E5.299, *wret* E6.288, *restrengent* E6.287, *Cheildren* (1721) E7.195^v, *ded* (did 1721) E7.195^v, *Lettell* (1721) E7.195^v, *thenk* (think 1721) E7.195^v, *tell* (till) S1.12, *wemen* S1.40, *pety* S2.16, *vesitt* S2.23, *hendred* S2.56, *geven* S2.58^v, *leved* (lived) S2.37, *slepery* S2.339, *speritless* S2.347, *Mecklemus* S2.351^v, *Phesick* S2.361^v, *setting* (sitting) S2.389^v, *gredyon* S2.468, *Merrekle* S2.480, *bed* (bid) S2.146, *afflection* S4.1, *besness* S4.34^v, *sesters* (1721) S4.58, *prent* (1733) S4.168, *seterical* (1728) S4.214^v, *whemsical* (1729) S4.225^v, *senc* (1731) S4.290, *henders* (1737) S5.67^v, *lettell* (1727) Hke.98, *hetherto* (1727) Hke. 162, *demenished* (1727) Hke. 146, *consederable* C1.226, *tell* (till) C1.343.

The interpretation of some of these spellings is problematical. The majority of them probably represent the lowering of [i] to [e], the former having been since restored under the influence of the spelling, but it is possible that some of them may represent [i:]. Professor Luick has shown that M.E. short [i] in open accented syllables was often lowered to [e:], which ultimately became [i:]; he accounts in this way for *beetle*, *evil*, *week*, *weevil*, etc. It is possible that some of the above *e*-spellings in open accented syllables,

pety, sety, leved, geven, slepe, wemen, etc., may represent this long vowel [i:], while two spellings, *St. Sweetins* (St. Swithin's) S2.86^v, and *Mr. Sheemell* (Shimell) C1.460 are clearly of this type. But the majority of the spellings rather suggest the use of [e], which in *spirit, sit*, etc., was commonly used as a vulgarism at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the next century.

Syrup was pronounced with [ʌ] by some people, *cf.* the spelling, *Surup* V2.97.

Present-day [e]. Two important variations from the normal short vowel [e] are suggested by the numerous spellings which replace *e* by *i* or *a*.

The tendency for a following nasal consonant to raise [e] to [i] has affected English pronunciation throughout its whole history, and the following spellings reveal pronunciations due to this tendency which have since been abandoned, probably because of the spelling or because they came to be regarded as Irish characteristics: *sincible* V1.77, *frindship* V1.163, *frinds* V1.163, *frind* Hn.286, *frindshipec* S1.12, *Kingsington* S1.155, *finins* (Jennings) S2.216, *Jinney* (Jenny) S2.5, *Kingsenton* S3.5, *printice* (1729) S4.47, *frind* (1729) S4.48^v, *sind* C1.337^v.

The same vowel was also frequently used in other positions. We now regard this pronunciation as characteristic of Irish dialect, which in itself is a testimony to its widespread use in seventeenth-century England. Among the eighteenth-century spellings which show this use of [i] are: *isterday* (yesterday) V1.380, *giting* V1.313, *gitt* V1.314, *kittle* V1.296, *Divill* V1.161, *sildom* V1.142, *yit* V1.105, *dicklaration* V1.105, *Liftenant* (1745) V2.199, *withier* (whether 1745) V2.234, *protiptions* Hn.91, *whither* Hn.148, *sildom* (1728), Hn. 310, *Licester* (1729) Hn.378^v, *Istimation* Hn.1, *gitt* E3.39, *divillish* E3.55, *Chirry* E3.64, *Litt* (let) E4.181, *sildom* E4.186^v, *diriction* E6.281, *forgittfulness* (1721) E7.290, *frish* S3.1^v, *mysilf* S4.21, *quistion* S4.34, *spilling* (1730) S5.45, *silfe* C1.319.

A further large group of spellings replaces the normal *e* by *a*. A number of the words in this group also appear in the above lists with *i*-substitutions. Since it seems clear that these *a*-substitutions represent the use of [æ] instead of the normal [e], it is apparent that three pronunciations were still used in the eighteenth century in some words of this type, [e] [i] and [æ]. The latter pronunciation is analogous to the common pronunciation, shown later, of *ar* for *er*. Among these *a*-spellings are: *fatch* V1.221, *yellow* V1.344,

Malincoliest V2.74, *alltogather* Hn.277, *langht* (length) Hn.288^v, *Mallancoly* E3.220, *wather* (whether) E3.441, *Latter* (letter 1721) E7.195^v, *frandes* (1721) E7.195^v, *Bast* (best 1721) E7.195^v, *Lat* (let 1721) E7.195^v, *Hallt* (health 1721) E7.195^v, *mallancolly* (1735) S1.434^v, *Assambly* (1735) S1.434^v, *yallow* S1.145, *than* (then) S1.115, *Amvoy* (envoy) S2.466, *naver* S4.21, *uary* (very) S4.20, *wather* (whether 1722) S4.29, *wan* (when 1733) S4.170, *halth* Hke.34, *elauen* (1727) Hke.162, *alltogather* C1.289.

A few spellings with *ee* instead of the usual *e* apparently mean that the writers used [i:], *sweets* (sweats) E6.281, *kept* (1735) S1.434^v, *slept* (1732) S1.415^v, *kept* (1733) S4.323^v, E3.33, *instead* S2.434^v. The past tenses are apparently new weak formations retaining the vowel of the present form, and the spellings *sweets*, *instead* reflect unshortened forms. An old pronunciation of *theatre* is reflected in the spelling, *Theayter* V1.113, while *ses* (says) S2.36^v, *Berry* (bury) S2.40^v replace anomalous correct spellings.

Present-day [æ]. The commonest substitution for the normal short *a* is *e*. It is possible that these spellings are merely reflections of the closeness of [æ] and [e], and should be taken to represent [æ]. On the other hand, the pronunciation of [e] was used by Thackeray to characterize certain vulgarisms of his time, and as many of the pronunciations shown by occasional spellings to have been used by good speakers in the seventeenth century became vulgar in the late eighteenth century, it is highly probable that the following spellings do indicate that the writers pronounced [e]: *thet* V1.111, *Bell Coney* (balcony) V1.115, *velew* E3.13, *extreuagant* Hn.294^v, *lemontations* S2.50, *heave* (have) E6.288, *telloe* (1726) S2.495, *ketcht* (caught 1726) S2.496, *ketch* S2.159, *gether* S2.171, *sett* (sat) S3.1, *greatetude* S4.1^v, *then* (than) S4.25, *Jen.ry* (January 1733) S4.168, *ketch* (1729) S4.49, *Redcliff* (Ratcliffe 1729) S4.235, *satisfectery* (1722) Hke.40, *satisfaction* (1722) Hke.34.

A few spellings which use *i* instead of *a* are apparently due to a further raising of this [e] to [i], chiefly before a nasal, viz: *think* (thank) E3.63^v, *exziht* (exact 1722) Hke.39, *thinks* (thanks) C1.343, *minzion* (mansion) C1.343.

Present-day [ɑ:]. Not many spellings of interest have been noted relating to the present day [ɑ:]. The anomalous spelling *er* which represents this vowel in many words is replaced by *ar* in: *hartyly* E3.13^v, *harty* E3.39, *hartfordshire* E3.41, *Barkshire* E3.24, *Darby* V1.120, *clark* S1.11^v, *hart* (heart) S1.21^v, *Barkley* S1.26, *harth*

S2.140, *sargen* (sergeant) C1.502. The same long vowel is probably indicated by the omission of *l* or the insertion of *r* in : *Metcafe* (1725) Hn.303^v, *farther* (father) C1.25.

A short vowel in *aunt* may be represented by *Ant* E3.65, Hke.34 ; *Spaw* (Spa) C2.328 was commonly sounded with [ɔ:] in the eighteenth century (*cf.* the similar pronunciation of *vase*, etc.) ; Sam Weller's pronunciation of *rather* as *rayther* is anticipated by the spelling *rether* S2.18, 353, etc. ; and *uernish* (varnish) Hn.55 may have been sounded with [ɔ:].

Present-day [ɔ]. The chief anomaly in the spellings which now represent [ɔ] is *a* in such words as *what*, *quarrel*, in which the [ɔ] is due to the labialization of the original [a] by the preceding labial consonant. This change probably took place during the seventeenth century. The following spellings show that the present vowel was used in such words in the early eighteenth century : *quolyty* V1.73, *wonts* V1.77, *quorill* V1.83, *wonted* V1.123, *wos* V1.139, *wonting* V1.119, *wos* (1729) Hn.378, *warrant* E4.164, *wott* E7.195^v, *wos* S2.20.

A few spellings indicate the use of a lengthened vowel [ɔ:] instead of the usual [ɔ], viz : *caust* (cost) Hn.253, *Caugh* (1726) S2.495, *stoap* (stop 1727) Hke.122v, *hawnes* (honest) C1.343, *poox* (pox) C1.333. The same long vowel is used before *f*, *s*, *th* by some good speakers at the present time.

A few spellings reveal the use of the unrounded vowel which was Lord Foppington's favourite affectation, viz. : *aparplexsy* V1.113, *resalue* Hn.274, *becase* (1721) E7.303, *safly* (softly 1733) S4.168, *band* (bond) C2.21. The substitution of *ar* for the normal *o* in *apoplexy* rather suggests that the sound represented by these substitutions was [a], resulting from the unrounding of [ɔ] without fronting.

Three spellings represent [ʌ] where [ɔ] is now often pronounced : *Vulponi* (1721) V2.90, *Mungomery* (1726) Hn.305, *Mongummary* (1726) Hn.305^v. The first pronunciation is an etymological one based upon Lat. *vulpus*. In *Montgomery* too the present use of [ɔ] is due to the spelling.

The following *o*-substitutions for anomalous correct spellings are not uninteresting : *becos* V1.76, *Loddonum* V1.383, *Lorrel* (laurel) S2.347.

Present-day [ɔ:]. The substitution of *o* for normal *au*, or the interchange of *ou* and *au*, prove that M.E. [au], which is the primary source of present-day [ɔ:], was in the early eighteenth century

pronounced as now, viz. *fol*t (fault) V1.107, *braught* V1.119, *fol*s (false) V1.85, *ogmentation* Hn.263, *scrolse* (scrawls) S2.73, *drown* (drawn) S4.36^v, *Lorson* (Lawson 1721) S4.56, *scrole* (scrawl 1728) S4.222, *plosible* (1725) S. 4.194^v, *braught* (1727) S4.341, *couse* (cause 1727) Hke.96.

The second source of [ɔ:] is M.E. [a] before *l* in closed syllables. The use of the present vowel is shown by the following spellings, which replace *a* before *l* by *o* or *au*: *oltard* V1.394, *fol*l V1.87, *olterd* (1721) E7.300, *bolsom* (1726) S2.495, *Taul* S2.434, *caul* S2.464, *waul* S2.184.

The third source of this vowel is M.E. *ar* preceded by [w] in closed syllables. Several substitutions of *o* for *a* prove the existence of the present-day vowel in such words in the speech of the eighteenth century: *Whorton* V1.134, *tords* (towards) V1.104, *Worr* V1.105, *worme* (warm) Hn.174^v, *quarterly* (1721) E7.300, *Whorton* (1725) S5.5^v.

The same vowel, derived from various M.E. sources, is also suggested by the following spellings: *Maulborgh* V1.111, *extrodinery* Hn.404, *Abrod* S1.23^v, *Molberry* (Marlborough) S2.58, *soard* (sword) S2.58^v. Two spellings, however, *boorn* S4.170, *boord* (board 1727) Hke.98 may represent [bo:rn] [bo:rd]. The use of [o:] instead of [ɔ:] is shown by Walker's *Dictionary*, 1791, to have existed late in the eighteenth century in some *or*-words. The short vowel [ɔ] is probably represented in the spelling, *Dosett* (Dorset, 1731) S4.256.

The chief variation from present-day practice was in the use of an unrounded vowel, probably [a:] where we now employ [ɔ:]. This unrounded vowel is, I think, reflected by the following spellings: *Arthentick* V1.105, *warters* (waters 1726) V2.98, *hanch* (1725) Hn.303^v, *extrardnary* E3.13, *dafturs* (daughters 1721) E7.303, *sasers* (saucers) S2.481, *ar* (or) S4.18, *Arderd* S4.23, *Lardship* (1724) S4.62, *Conart* (Connaught 1726) S4.196, *dâters* (1729) C2.328, *grat* (groat) C1.404^v, *layer* (lawyer) C1.405. The pronunciations represented by such spellings are now mostly dialectal, but some of them are used by Dickens and Thackeray to typify the London vulgarianism of the nineteenth century.

Present-day [u]. Little of interest has been found in the substituted spellings of words which are now pronounced with [u]. The only forms of importance are the following which may represent the use of [ʌ], arising from an early shortening of the original late

M.E. [u:], *stud* (stood) S2.72, *understud* S4.25, *Louckt* (looked) C1.176, *Loucking* C1.206, *fouttmen* C1.460.

In *woollen*, *put*, the M.E. [u] has survived into present-day pronunciation owing to the effectiveness of the preceding labial consonants in preventing unrounding to [ʌ]. The unrounded vowel was used, however, in the seventeenth century, as some of the contemporary orthoepists' statements prove, and it is probably represented by these forms: *wullen* S2.347^v, *pat* S4.54.

Present-day [u:]. The use of the present-day [u:] derived from M.E. [o:] is shown in a few spellings which replace *o*, *oo* by *u*, viz.: *due* (do) V1.71, *chusing* V1.126, *sune* V1.106, *duing* V1.111, *chuse* S1.5, *due* C1.25^v, *sounare* C1.460. The same vowel was used in *soop* (soup) S2.102^v.

Present-day [ʌ]. The substitution of *u* for various anomalous spellings in words which are now pronounced with [ʌ] suggest that normally in the early eighteenth century this vowel was pronounced in the same words as it is now. Among such forms are: *unions* (onions) V1.393, *Burrow* (borough) V1.309, *enuf* V1.107, *Chumley* (Cholmondoley) V1.114, *Rufe* E4.147, *amungst* S2.384^v, *affrunt* S2.76, *truble* C1.185, *Cumb* (come) C1.498, *ondun* C1.498, *munths* C1.502, *wunderfull* S2.384; and also *wone* (one) C1.213, *wonce* (once) S1.39.

Two spellings, however, clearly represent the retention of the original rounded vowel [u], which is the chief source of present-day [ʌ], viz.: *soop* (sup) V1.375, *tooched* S1.31. The pronunciation of *one* as [wæn], a form which is now dialectal, is probably represented by *wan* (1733) S4.170^v.

A few other words were pronounced differently from the present-day manner. Two spellings patently reflect the use of [i], viz. *Shittlecock* (1723) V2.134, *Skidmore* (Scudamore) S2.391^v; while four others which replace normal *u* by *e* prove the use by these writers of [e], a type of pronunciation which is used by Dickens (*Pickwick*, etc.) to represent London vulgarisms of his time, viz. *Sheten* (shutting 1745) V2.199, *jest* (just 1748) V2.244, *shet* (shut) E4.149, *jest* (just) S1.81.

Present-day [ə:]. By far the most frequent substitutions found in these documents relate to the three M.E. groups *er*, *ir*, *ur*, which are now, in closed syllables, all pronounced [ə:]. These spellings are of two distinct types. In the first group the three normal spellings are interchanged without the slightest consistency; for

example, a word normally spelt with *er* is often written with either *ir* or *ur*, and, of course, with the correct *er*. It seems clear that the three groups represent at this time only one pronunciation. That pronunciation is described by various lexicographers and orthoepists of the late eighteenth century, Elphinston, Johnston, Walker, etc., as [Ar], but I am inclined to think that it was actually the same vowel [ə:] which we now use. Typical among the substituted spellings of this type which I have noted in the documents examined for this article are: *Erwin* (Irwin) V1.110, *inferme* V1.314, *Kerby* Hn.125, *conferming* Hn.225, *nerserry* E6.259^v, *therty* S2.435^v, *sherts* S2.341, *ster* S2.365, *merth* S2.408, *infermiry* (1738) C2.187, *ferstt* C1.176; *devirsions* V1.219, *ditirring* V2.40, *thirsday* Hn.76, *sirved* (1729) Hn.394, *tirke* (1729) Hn.402, *disirues* E3.65, *pirson* (1729) C2.350, *sirtaine* C1.212, *firder* (further) C1.185, *defired* C1.333, *hir* C1.333, *sirvant* C1.334, *sirvice* C1.337^v, *tirms* C1.405; and *durty* Hn.227^v, *stur* (1728) Hn.309^v, *Burth Day* S1.77^v, *flurting* (1729) S4.237, *furst* (1725) S5.8^v, *curcumstances* (1725) S5.6, *thurdy* C1.498.

More frequently, however, *ar* is substituted for normal *er*. These substitutions represent, of course, a pronunciation analogous to that which we now use in *clerk*, *Derby*, etc., and derive from a late M.E. lowering of *er* to *ar*. At this period, the sound used may have been [a:] or [æ:], since none of the seventeenth or eighteenth-century orthoepists seem to recognize the existence of an open back vowel. It is interesting that Walker, in his *Dictionary*, 1791, states that thirty years before *er* was universally pronounced *ar* in some words, although at the time he wrote this pronunciation was vulgar. Among the spellings noted are: *disparsed* V1.73, *detarminable* V1.74, *Clargy* V1.81, *sartingly* V1.378, *sarvant* V1.309, *hard* (heard) V1.266, *marcy* V1.250, *Varnie* V1.206, *convarses* V1.160, *Clarges* V1.161, *consarns* V1.123, *Revartion* V1.111, *Garmons* V1.111, *Marchant* V1.117, *presarve* V1.88, *Farmanagh* (1745), V2.199, *prefar'd* V2.18, *sarvice* V2.60, *divartion* V2.76, *parsons* (persons 1745) V2.200, *obsarued* Hn.25, *presarue* Hn.25^v, *desarued* Hn.242^v, *parfect* Hn.274^v, *starline* Hn.281^v, *marcyes* E4.149, *Bartram* (1735) S1.436, *Garmain* (Jermyn 1735) S1.434^v, *hard* (heard) S2.2, *obsarvent* S2.48, *sarment* (sermon 1729) S2.508^v, *sarched* S2.384, *parfitt* S2.385, *marchant* (1729) S4.48, *desarve* (1733) S4.170, *parsonable* (1733) S4.170, *resarve* (1725) S4.194^v, *Larneing* (1728) S4.216, *Clargey* (1731) S4.242^v, *divarsions* (1731) S4.271^v, *consarn'd* (1734) S4.333, *auartions* S4.42^v, *presarve* (1731) S4.242, etc.

A comparison of the two groups of spellings will make it abundantly clear that many *er*-words were still in the first third of the eighteenth century pronounced in two ways, with [ə:] and with [æ:] or [ɑ:]. Among these words were, *diversion*, *serve*, *servant*, *service*, *terms*, *person*, etc.

A few interesting variations from these types have also been found. *Heard*, *first* were apparently occasionally pronounced [hiəd] [fəst], cf. *heird* (1726) Hke.90 and *fust* VI.106, 132. Both of these pronunciations were later regarded as vulgarisms; while one spelling found twice in the *Hatton Papers* suggests the use of a pronunciation now used in the American and Irish forms of English, viz. *goirls* (girls 1729) Hn.374, 376. The accented pronunciation of *were* as [wɛə] is frequently indicated by such spellings as, *ware* (1722) V2.75, E4.155, S1.415 (1732), *whear* (1748) V2.240.

(To be concluded)

THE OFFICE OF THYLE IN *BEOWULF*

By D. E. MARTIN CLARKE

THE following article is based on a consideration of part of Dr. G. Hübener's book *England und die Gesittungsgrundlage der europäischen Frühgeschichte* (published 1930) and on an article contributed by him to the April number of the *R.E.S.* called "Beowulf and Germanic Exorcism." Very briefly the view expressed in those is that certain stories in Germanic literature (as, for example, the epic of Beowulf) concerned with a hero's victory over a demon are in origin the outcome of a custom in early Germanic history. This custom is the practice of demon exorcism. It is, of course found all over the world among peoples, both in the past and in the present, but the peculiar feature of the Germanic variety is that the exorcist is identical with the hero. Dr. Hübener shows that the "heroic" civilization arose out of a past predominantly magic and has presented to us in story heroes who have magical as well as physical power. The main instrument of the exorcist (as of the hero) is the sword. But Dr. Hübener has more to say on this aspect of his subject and hopes to contribute a further article in the near future.

It is not suggested in this theory that in the Beowulf poem, for example, as we have it now there are conscious recollections of heroic exorcism. This motif no longer has its full original force; and we should expect to find traces of it not in the comprehensible parts of the poem but in the perplexing ones. To account for such perplexities in the poem it is necessary to realize that there are at least three layers of material in it, viz. the original experiences of the ghosts and their exorcism in the soul of the hero and the afflicted persons; secondly, the interpretation of these experiences by the onlookers who formed the traditions; and thirdly, the expression of them by the poet(s) who may or may not have been aware of the full significance of these traditions. There are still certain incidents in the story which are difficult to explain and it seems worth while considering whether Dr. Hübener's theory will throw any more light on these.

It is proposed here to deal with those which centre in the personality of Unferth, the thyle. The following questions arise in connexion with the part played by him in *Beowulf* :

1. Why is he ungracious to Beowulf on his arrival when all the rest of the warriors are courteous ?
2. Why is this ignored by his fellows and by Hrothgar ?
3. Why is he so much respected when he is said to have killed his own kindred ?
4. Why does Beowulf accuse him personally of having failed against Grendel ?
5. Why does he lend Beowulf his victory weapon Hrunting to use against Grendel's mother ?
6. Why is it unsuccessful ?

An unconvincing explanation is given in *Beowulf* as if in answer to query 5. The poet says that Unferth forgot when he became reconciled to Beowulf the speech he had made when drunk with beer. A statement like this makes one suggest that distinction may well be made in drawing conclusions from the poem between what the poet says in the narrative (perhaps a later addition to the whole) and what is put in the mouths of the characters. Is the poet here as perplexed as we are ? Finally it must be remembered that the theory must be used in accordance with the spirit of the law and not pressed to solve literally textual minutiae which might well be explained in various ways. With these preparatory remarks we may begin our examination.

Is the secret of Unferth's behaviour bound up with the unfamiliar office of thyle which he holds in Hrothgar's court ? This office has been frequently commented upon. There is a description of the thulr (cognate O.N. form) in the O.N. poem *Hávamál*, and to the comments¹ on it readers may be referred. In their recently published book, *The Growth of Literature*, the Chadwicks have compared the office with that of the Irish filid and suggested that there were elements in common. They suggest for thulr-thyle (1) poet ; (2) an (old) sage especially versed in antiquarian lore ; (3) a prophet ; (4) a spokesman. In the *Hávamál* the god Othinn is called the *fimbulthulr*, i.e. the mighty thulr. We need go no further than the *Ynglingasaga*,² for some of the characteristics of this chief of the thulir.

¹ *The Hávamál*, ed. D. E. Martin Clarke, pp. 10 ff.

² *Ynglingasaga*, ed. F. Jónson, 1912, cap. vii. pass.

"Othinn often changed his appearance. His body lay as if asleep or dead and he became bird or beast, fish or serpent. He went in an instant to far off lands on his own and other men's errands. At times he awakened dead men out of the earth . . . for this he was called the Lord of Ghosts. Because of these things he became very wise. He taught all these magic arts by means of runes and songs, called enchantments. Othinn himself knew and pursued that magic art which brought most power. From it he knew much of men's fate and future, likewise how to bring men death, ill-luck, or ill-health and to take from certain men their understanding and power to give it to others. But most of these magic arts he taught his priests: they were next to him in all information and sorcery."

That the office of thulr was not merely a literary conception may be shown by reference to a picture given by Wimmer¹ of a memorial stone at present in the Nationalmuseets Runehal at Copenhagen. It was found at Snoldelev in the neighbourhood of Copenhagen in the eighteenth century and commemorates the son of a certain Hróald thulr at Salhaugar. It would seem to date from 800 to 825 and was apparently originally set up inside a grave mound. From Wimmer's picture three horns and a swastika are engraved on it.

We should expect a thyle to have some sign of office and in *Beowulf* (as in *Hávamál*) he is given a special seat. On two important occasions Unferth is represented as sitting at Hrothgar's feet,² from which position he plays his part.³

In other respects too, however, Unferth shows characteristics typical of the thyle. He is the person in Hrothgar's court who has detailed information about the history of the new arrival, *Beowulf*. He is the sage, the wise man with well-stocked mind.

But what is more striking about him, because in contrast to the courtesy of the rest, is that when *Beowulf* appears he is ungracious and quarrelsome. The poet says he unbinds the battle runes and that *Beowulf's* venture is vexatious to him because he is jealous. This characteristic links him up with the type of prophet priest, the shaman⁴ (here used in the general sense of a divining exorcising

¹ Wimmer, *De Danske Rune mindesmaerker*, 1914, p. 98.

² *Beowulf*, 500 and 1166.

³ In *Hávamál*, strophe 111, he is given a special seat. Even in later uses of the O.N. verb *thylja* there is almost always reference in the context to the position of the person who is speaking in this way.

⁴ Cp. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, cap. viii. and especially p. 172.

priest). This in turn reminds us of Dr. Hübener's view that parts of *Grettissaga* represent one of the most straightforward accounts of such a person, and we note at once that Grettir has a quarrelsome,¹ difficult temperament. There is no indication in *Grettissaga*, however, that the hero holds an office. One of his preoccupations is undoubtedly with the destruction of ghost demons, but there is no indication that he is anything more than a free-lance. Is it therefore because Unferth is thyle that his ungraciousness is condoned?

Another point, however, here must be noted. Unferth is held in high repute by his fellows. We may now perhaps suggest that this too is because he is thyle, though the poet also says (in the extant text) men had faith in his spirit and great courage. It is interesting to note that unless these epithets are later additions we have here warrior qualities ascribed to Unferth. Even if he is thyle he is also *beorn*. Beowulf calls² him *widcuthne* (famous) and *modig*³ (valorous). Indeed, we might ask whether in Unferth Dr. Hübener's idea of hero-exorcist is not most completely exemplified.

To continue our examination: Beowulf's retort to Unferth's quarrelsomeness is that Unferth himself has failed. We may, while allowing for the exaggeration of the *beot* made by Beowulf, note that he does (using the 2nd person singular) say explicitly that Unferth is to blame for the ravages of Grendel, because his courage has failed to stop them. Here again we may compare with *Grettissaga* where the successful Grettir is preceded by the unsuccessful Thorgaut and also by Glámr (who himself becomes the haunting demon). It is not too much to suggest that in the *Beowulf* as in the story of Grettir more than one individual made an effort to get rid of the demon-monsters. Indeed, Hrothgar himself suggests this.⁴

Another important trait in the Unferth motif in *Beowulf* is his association with a sword,⁵ Hrunting. After *Beowulf's* first success

¹ *Íslendingasögur Grettissaga*, 1900, cap. xiv, xv., etc. Note, too, that some traits of the young Grettir are characteristic of the young Beowulf. Cp. *Beowulf*, 2183 ff.

² 1165 and 1812.

³ It is because of such epithets that I cannot agree with Miss Welsford's view that the thyle by the time of *Beowulf* has become a kind of court-jester and that his rudeness might even be a good omen because it averted the evil eye. E. Welsford, *The Fool* (1935).

⁴ Line 484. Miss Daunt gave me this reference. To her and to Dr. Hübener I owe thanks for discussion on this subject.

⁵ Unferth (if metathesis = Marpeace) is the son of Ecglaf, a name which means a sword heirloom.

with Grendel, when he explicitly renounces the help of a sword, and after the vengeance of Grendel's mother, we learn that Beowulf, fully armed, is going to track the monster to her lair. This time he is using both armour and weapons, and it is Unferth's sword which he carries with him.

It is noteworthy that if Dr. Hübener's view that the hero-exorcist often uses a sword for exorcism be true, we have here one explanation of Unferth's action, if only negative. Unferth in any case would not offer Hrunting against Grendel because Beowulf is not using the sword type of exorcism against him.

The poet gives a careful description of Hrunting which shows that it is like almost all the swords in *Beowulf*: it is an heirloom, a weapon that has never failed; it has been hardened in the sweat of battle, and it has the special decoration called *atertanum fah*. Beowulf expresses his confidence in it. When it fails him he reverts to his previous method of getting rid of Grendel, *i.e.* by wrestling (*getruwode mundgripe maegenes*), but is only successful when he sees and makes use of the old *eotenisc* sword from among the gear in the cave.

Hrunting then is ousted by the sword in the cave. Here perhaps the story of Kárr's weapon in *Grettissaga* may be relevant. The seax,¹ the story of which is given at the end of this article, became Grettir's favourite weapon and was called Kársnaut. As a boy, however, when he was going out into the world his mother had given him a sword, an heirloom called Jökulsnaut, and this Grettir abandoned for the seax from Kárr's burial mound. The question arises in both stories, Why did the one weapon accomplish what the others did not? In both the above examples the weapon succeeded which had been in touch with the dead.¹ Was this the reason that Grettir wanted to possess Kársnaut so much?

Of the questions I put forward at the beginning of this article I have suggested possible answers to all but No. 3, in which we asked why Unferth was respected when he had committed a heinous crime, that of slaying his own brothers. It is only by a more profound consideration of Dr. Hübener's theory that an answer to this may be suggested. Some of the characteristics of the thyle point to a connexion in the dark abysm of time with the magician-king so

¹ The fact that it is as a knife (or sword) exorcist especially that we must consider the Germanic hero is to be treated by Dr. Hübener himself in a further article. He is prepared to maintain that the seax is the older weapon and the more closely connected with magical ritual.

elaborately described and emphasized in Frazer's *Golden Bough*. This suggestion has already been made by Professor Olrik.¹ One of the characteristics of these officers, Frazer tells us, is that they have not only special magical privileges and obligations but also a peculiar code of conduct: it may therefore be suggested that the thyle was exempt from the ordinary social requirements of the warriors of his society.

In the above article I have selected almost all my examples from within a very limited area, working out from the material to the general theory. In a complex literary composition like the *Beowulf* it is clear that more than one explanation can be put forward for most obscurities, and I would not emphasize the importance of any specific point I have tried to elucidate. I would, however, venture to suggest that when they are all taken together and when it is remembered that other obscurities in the poem may be illuminated in the same way they do reveal some of the integral elements in the story, just as treatment by the ultra-violet ray reveals in old manuscripts readings that have become obscure or have even disappeared.

ADDITIONAL NOTE (*Grettissaga*)

From the Howe of Kárr the old, father of a certain Thorfinnr, Grettir when he had laid the ghost brought away treasure (xviii). There was one thing among this he specially coveted, a seax than which he had never seen a better. Thorfinnr said it was an heirloom and Grettir would have to earn it. After the slaying of the berserkers by Grettir Thorfinnr gave it him (xx): indeed, Grettir had used it against the berserkers. It had been lent him by the wife of Thorfinnr, who kept it hanging near his bed with the other weapons belonging to his ancestor (xix). It was with this seax that Grettir cut off the head of Glámr and also the right arm of the troll woman. In the cave under the waterfall both the giant and Grettir at first fought with seaxes, and only when the giant's seax is destroyed by Grettir does he try to seize a sword which is hanging in the cave. It was this seax Grettir had with him to his death and which had to be cut away from his dead hand.

¹ *Danske Studier*, 1909.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

ON THE DATE OF THE LETTER WRITTEN BY SIR PHILIP SIDNEY TO CHRISTOPHER PLANTIN¹

IN his edition of Sidney's *Complete Works* (Cambridge University Press, iii. 134), Professor Albert Feuillerat printed the following letter sent by Sir Philip Sidney to Christopher Plantin :

Les mappes de lortelius en la plus nouvelle édition.
Le livre en flaman descriptant les havres de leurope.
La description des villes et forteresses

Je vous prie Mons. Plantin que je puisse avoir ces livres et ne
faudray point de vous les rembourser et en récompense demeure.

Vostre affectionné ami pour vous faire plaisir et service.

Ph. Sidney.

Professor Feuillerat apparently considered the letter to have been written in 1580/1, as he printed it among the correspondence of that period, but it is quite certain that Sidney's letter cannot be dated before 1584 and, in all probability, even somewhat later.

As we shall see that the first two books can be positively identified as books actually printed by Plantin, it seems reasonable (in the absence of any contradictory note in the letter) to suppose that the third book would have had Plantin's imprint—if, indeed, it was not actually printed by him. If Sidney was referring in the case of the third book to a work not bearing the imprint "Ex officina Plantiniana" and the first two were from that press, it is difficult to see how he could have expected Plantin to know precisely what book he wanted. I have no doubt that Sidney really had three books of Plantin's in mind ; for if he was not ordering such works, he would most certainly have been more specific in recording the title of the books he wanted, or he would at least have given some indication of the printer of the various works.

The publications of the Plantin press are known not only through the occasional "hand-lists" issued by that press (*Catalogus Librorum*

¹ The original letter is in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.

a *Christophoro Plantino excussorum*, Antwerpiæ 1575, 1584, 1596, etc.) but also through modern bibliographies (C. Ruelens and A. de Backer, *Annales Plantiniennes*, Paris, 1866, etc.) so that it is comparatively easy to identify the books Sidney wanted. The first is, of course, Abraham Ortelius's well-known *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, of which the first edition printed by Plantin appeared in 1579. An edition in German of 1580, copies of which are in the British Museum and in the National Library in Warsaw, or more probably a Latin one of 1584 would represent the "newest edition" referred to by Sidney. (The "editio princeps" of this work, incidentally, was issued by Gilles Coppens de Diest, Antwerp, 1570, the book meeting with such success that at least ten separate editions were printed before Plantin's appeared.¹)

The second item should have suggested to Feuillerat the approximate date of this letter. The only book that corresponds to Sidney's "Les havres de leurope" is the famous *Speculum Nauticum*, the first book containing printed maritime charts, published by Plantin in 1584.

"De Spieghel der Zeevaerdt, vande navigatie der Westersche Zee, innehoudende alle de custen van Vrancryck, Spaignen ende t'principaelste deel van Engelandt, in diversche zee Caerten begrepen, met den gebruycke van dien, nu met grooter naersticheyt by een vergadert ende ghepractizeert door Lucas Jansz. Waghenae, piloot ofte stuyrman residerende inde vermaerde zeestadt Enchuysen. Ghedruct tot Leyden by Christoffel Plantyn voor Lucas Janssz. Waghenae van Enckhuysen. MDLXXXIV."

The third volume is, however, more difficult to identify. It has been shown that the first two books were issued by Plantin so that one would naturally expect the third work also to have been printed by him. No single book, however, appears to have been issued by the Plantin press (prior to 1586) that corresponds exactly to Sidney's description. The following *two* Plantin books most nearly approximate Sidney's title; in as much as Pasino's book is in quarto and Guicciardini's in folio, the tempting suggestion that Sidney saw these two works bound together must, unfortunately, be dismissed; it is not impossible, however, that Sidney merely confused the two.

"Description de tous les Païs-Bas, autrement appelés la Germanie inférieure, ou Basse-Allemagne, par Messire Louis Guicciardin, gentilhomme florentin: maintenant revue et augmentée plus que de la moitié

¹ See J. Denuce, *Oud-Nederlandsche Kaartmakers in betrekking met Plantijn*, Uitgaven der Antwerpsche Bibliophilen 27-28, Antwerp, 1912-13.

par le mesme autheur. Avec toutes les cartes geographicques desdicts pais, et plusieurs pourtraicts de villes tirés au naturel. Avec Indice tres-ample des choses les plus memorables. A Anvers, de l'imprimerie de Christophe Plantin. MDLXXXII."¹

Sidney's reference to a book on fortresses,² a much more uncommon item in the contemporary booksellers' stocks than those having only descriptions of cities, leads me to believe that he had another work in mind.

"Discours sur plusieurs poincts de l'architecture de guerre, concernant les fortifications tant anciennes que modernes. Ensemble le moyen de bastir et fortifier une place de laquelle les murailles ne pourront aucunement estre endommagées de l'artillerie. Par M. Aurelio de Pasino Ferrarois, architecte de très-illustre seigneur, Monseigneur le duc de Buillon. A Anvers, de l'imprimerie de Christoffe Plantin, imprimeur de sa Majesté. MDLXXIX."

Sidney was, of course, one of the strongest advocates of the theory that the Spanish advance in the Netherlands could best be checked by attacking the Spanish seaports and destroying their trade on the high seas, thereby forcing them to withdraw at least a part of their forces from the Netherlands. In the summer of 1585 he enthusiastically welcomed the preparations made by Drake for the equipment of a great fleet, and in August of that year he travelled secretly to Plymouth with the obvious intention of joining the expedition. Drake, apparently fearing that the Queen might be angry if he permitted Sidney to participate in this undertaking, prevented his doing so. It is my opinion that Sidney wrote to Plantin before August 1585, while he was planning to join Drake's expedition. The books he ordered were ideally suited to such an enterprise; the first two works³ became at this time the indispens-

¹ An Italian edition of this work had been issued the previous year. An English translation appeared in 1593 (*S.T.C.* 12, 463) under the title "The Description of the Low countreys and of the Prouinces, thereof, gathered into an Epitome."

² Only on one occasion does Guicciardini describe a fortification at length, i.e. in the case of Antwerp (Plantin, 1588, p. 88 and following). Usually the military defences are briefly dismissed; so Deventer "... è città molto forte & ben' munita, di bonissima muraglia, oue fra le altre, è la porta chiamata Brinconi, opera bella & eccellente." The important seaport, Gravelines, with its new fortifications is described thus: "Gravelinghe—sarà forse la piu forte terra di tutti questi paesi, con vn' buon' Castello & baluardi marauigliosi."

³ I am indebted to Dr. R. B. McKerrow for the following information. In 1585 the Lord Admiral of England, Lord Charles Howard, drew the attention of the Privy Council to Waghenar's book. Sir Anthony Ashley was commissioned to translate it into English and the work appeared in the latter part of 1588 (*S.T.C.* 24, 931). The title of this work is described in the *D.N.B.* (ii. 170) as:

able maritime reference books, and, if we can identify this book with Sidney's request, the inclusion of Pasino's work may possibly indicate Sidney's views on naval strategy. Drake's expedition developed into a mere punitive voyage, with the principal object of obtaining booty and of destroying Spanish cities and trade. To judge from this third request, it would appear that Sidney's plans included not only the capture of Spanish seaports but also the fortifying and holding of them, with the expected result that the Spaniards, harassed in their own country, would be forced to abandon their plans of expansion elsewhere. It is interesting to recall that Monson, writing several years later, concurred with this opinion,

"But it seems our long peace made us inexperienced of advice in war; for had we kept and defended those places when in our possession and provided to have been relieved and succoured out of England, we had diverted the war from this part of Europe into America. For at that time there was no comparison betwixt the strength of Spain and England by sea, by means whereof we might have better defended them and encroached upon the rest of the Indies, than the King of Spain could have aided or succoured them" (*The Naval Tracts of Sir William Monson*, Naval Records Society, 1902, i. 123).

No other books of the period were of more practical value in formulating plans for extensive naval operations than these, and it is surely no bold conjecture to suggest that it was for this purpose that Sidney ordered the three volumes from Plantin.

For the sake of completeness, I must point out that the letter *might* possibly be assigned to a later period, even though the internal evidence points so decisively to the summer of 1585. On November 7, 1585, Queen Elizabeth signed a patent appointing Sidney governor of Flushing, and only eleven days later he had already arrived at his new post. As the Spaniards held the nearby Antwerp, it was essential for a governor of the Dutch seaport to be acquainted with the latest methods of defending the city against a possible siege and to be thoroughly familiar with the neighbouring coastline. In that case, of course, both Guicciardini's and Pasino's

"The Mariners Mirrour—of Navigation, First made and set fourth in divers exact Sea Charts by that famous Navigator Luke Wagenar of Enchuisen, and now fitted with necessarie additions for the use of Englishmen by Anthony Ashley. Heerin also may be understood the exploits lately atchived by the right Honorable L. Admiral of England with her Ma^{ties} Navie, and some former services done by that worthy knight S^r Fra. Drake." The title thus connects this work directly with Drake's expedition.

books would have proved most useful, but surely the coast and harbours of Zeeland would have been more accurately displayed and therefore better suited to Sidney's immediate needs, in a local *portulan* than in the books by Waghenaeer and Ortelius, the charts of which are necessarily on a smaller scale as they cover the entire coastline of Western Europe.

Did Sidney send his request to Plantin with the idea of acquainting himself with his new duties as governor of Flushing? The evidence that may be deduced from the contents of the letter points almost certainly to the summer of 1585 rather than to the winter of that year. The departure of Drake's fleet (September 14, 1585) realized, to some extent, Sidney's plans for a direct attack on the Spanish coast and we may take it for granted that, with the departure of the expedition, Sidney's expectations of participating in a naval manœuvre vanished, and whatever need of maps he had after that time was limited to local charts of the Netherlands. This need, as I have shown above, would have been more adequately filled by the *portulans* than by the larger atlases printed by Plantin. The attack on Axel (July 6/7, 1586) was made "by night and in boats," but can scarcely be made to represent a naval undertaking so extensive that the Plantin charts were essential to the success of the venture. It was, indeed, only a small local encounter and was doubtless planned with the assistance of a native "stuyrman" perfectly familiar with the mouth of the West Schelde and more to be relied upon than any small-scale map.

CURT F. BÜHLER.

THE NINTH EARL OF NORTHUMBERLAND QUOTES HIS ANCESTOR HOTSPUR

HENRY PERCY, ninth Earl of Northumberland, seems to have inherited the temper that gave to his famous forebear his nickname Hotspur. It is especially interesting, therefore, to find Northumberland citing Hotspur by name, and echoing a few words of his famous quarrel with Glendower, in a testy letter to the Earl of Salisbury, written probably in 1628.¹ The paraphrase is so close

¹ The endorsement, in a later hand, is 1609. Since the day, in Northumberland's writing, is January 29, this would mean 1610, new style; but the year is almost certainly 1628, as is explained below.

to the words of the play, and yet so free, as to make it clear that Northumberland familiarly knew Shakespeare's lines.

The letter, in the Earl's own writing, and preserved at Hatfield House, concerns the proposed marriage of Salisbury's daughter with Northumberland's son. Percy is protesting against what he considers to be two unreasonable demands made by Cecil: the one, a "portion for dawghters that is not yett in being"; the other, "that I should assure all the land I have 2000^l excepted upon my sonne."

It is at the climax of his spirited objection to the first proposal that he refers to Hotspur:

"... therefore my Lo: lett us runne in a straight line, without turnings and windings, as Henry Hottspurre would have it, when Mortimer and he divided England in a mappe."

The following lines from the debate of Hotspur, Glendower, Mortimer, and Worcester come at once to mind:

Glend: Come, here's the map: shall be divide our right?

Hots: See how this river comes me cranking in.

I'll have the current in this place damm'd up,
And here the smug and silver Trent shall run
In a new channel, fair and evenly:
It shall not wind with such a deep indent.

Glend: Not wind! It shall, it must; you see it doth.

Worc: Yea, but a little charge will trench him here,
And on this north side win this cape of land;
And then he runs straight and even.

Hots: I'll have it so.

Glend [yielding]: Come, you shall have Trent turned.¹

So explicit an allusion to Shakespeare's words so near Shakespeare's own lifetime is rare enough; and this one is all the more arresting in that it comes from Hotspur's direct descendant, ninth bearer of the title which Hotspur would have held, as second Earl, had he not fallen at Shrewsbury.

The letter is so interesting in itself, and in relation to North-

¹ *Henry IV*, Pt. I, III. i. 70 ff. This quarrel, it will be recalled, is Shakespeare's invention, without basis in Holinshed's account of the tripartite division.

Northumberland's *Advice to his Son* (put into form for this same boy, Algernon, then aged seven, in 1609)¹ that a brief account of it and a full transcript are here appended.

It is written from Petworth, to which the Earl retired after his release from the Tower in 1621. The young man is enchained, we are told, by the beauty of Salisbury's daughter, who is undoubtedly the Lady Anne Cecil to whom Lord Percy was happily married, though against his father's wish, in 1629 (*D.N.B.*); Salisbury, accordingly, is the second Earl, son of the Robert Cecil whose friendship and "ancient familiarity" Percy often vainly invoked after his disgrace and whom he thenceforth accounted a treacherous friend and a persecutor.² The details of the letter and its hostile tone square with the gossip of the day :

My Lord Percy is upon marrying with my Lord Salisbury's daughter, £11,000 being her portion ; but my Lord of Northumberland is averse, because her grandfather was his greatest enemy. (Rev. J. Mead to Sir M. Stuteville, Jan. 12, 1627/8, in Birch, *Court . . . of Chas. I.*, 1848, i. 312.)

Fortune . . . did some years after allot his [Northumberland's] Son the Lord Percy a Wife out of the Family of Salisbury, whose blood the Father said, would not mingle in a Bason, so averse was he from it. (Osborn, F., *Traditional Memoires On The Reign of King James*, in his *Works*, 8th ed., 1682, 450.)

Mead's note practically fixes January, 1628, as the correct date for Percy's letter. That its period is near 1628-9, rather than 1609 (as the endorsement has it), is borne out by considerable evidence in the letter : the son (only seven in 1609) is fettered by the lady's beauty ; the Countess (*d.* 1619) is already dead, as the Earl refers to possible remarriage ; he is at Petworth, to which he was not released from his long imprisonment till 1621 ; grandchildren of his own are living, as they were in the 1620's but not in 1609 ; most convincing of all, Northumberland addresses an Earl of Salisbury who is "but a stranger" to him, whereas the first Earl was his associate and professed friend. Though the hints at remarriage and at the chances of future warfare, capture, and ransom for himself are somewhat surprising from a man of sixty-four, as the earl

¹ *Advice to His Son*, by Henry Percy, ninth Earl of Northumberland. Ed. G. B. Harrison, 1930. See Dr. Harrison's introduction for an account of Percy ; for added evidences of his uncontrolled temper, see De Fonblanque, *Annals of the House of Percy*, 1887, ii. 185, 216 ff., and often.

² De Fonblanque, ii. 370 ; also 236, 237, 290, 294, 313, etc.

was in 1628, they may be taken as the unconsidered flings of his anger.

Undoubtedly, then, the letter which follows belongs to January, 1628, when the Percy blood once again rose hot against a Cecil : ¹

[Earl of] Northumberland to [the Earl of] Salisbury.

MY LORD,

I stayed your servant a day longe[r] than he was willing, I was full of paine and am soe still, therefore cannot make any long discourse whiche I hope you will excuse : but to the matter. Thus. I cannot chuse but know what 12000^l is in any of our purses of our qualites and how littell it is agayne in theas tymes when we comme to the spending it.

I have considered your Lo: demands, I find two of them in myne opinion unreasonable, and sutch as I shall never grant to soe long as I breathe ; the one nether in part nor in whole which is the portion for dawghters that is not yett in being,² a new devise, rarely used, and in myne opinion very dangerous for them and Fathers also ; for it will seclude all obedience when they stand not at the fathers will by obeing him or his commands : it layes them open to all abusive needy persons, that if they can but gaine a poore yong girles good opinion, she is lost and the father must pay for it whether he will or noe : soe as I conclude that I will never be an instrument to breede that disobedience ; I love not my sonne soe evell as to thrust sutch a thorne in his heele : for believe me my Lo: I never saw mariages made with too great tyes ever prosper, and obedience to it in what sort soe ever, ether religious obedience or morall obedience, and it was ever bounded by reward or punnishment, else came it to nothing nor did ever prosper : therfore lett them trust to the care of ther fathers as we trusted to ours : I meane not by theas too great tyes, matters of jointers, fitt for the place, fitt for dwelling, not too farre disperste for a womans manage, for soe shall the heire be the looser in the end ; but I mean sutch tyes as shall make the wyfe insult upon her husband, or the sonnes or dawghters neglect and be careless of ther

¹ Cecil (Hatfield) Papers 126/168-9, from a transcript permitted by the kindness of the Marquess of Salisbury, and furnished me by J. V. Lyle, esq., Librarian at Hatfield House.

The error in endorsing it as of 1609 is natural, in that the letter has no year-date in the original hand ; most of the Hatfield papers antedate the first Earl's death in 1612 ; and in 1609/10 negotiation was under way for the marriage of Frances Cecil, the first Earl's daughter, who married Henry Clifford in the summer of 1610 (Cecil, A., *Life of Robert Cecil*, 1915, p. 372). Both Frances and her sister, who were babies in the years around 1593-7, would have been considerably older than Algernon Percy, born in 1602 ; although this fact would not have prevented discussion of a marriage between one of them and young Percy, still it is clear on other evidence that the girl of the letter is Lady Frances' niece, Lady Anne Cecil.

² This condition might almost be suspected of prognostic force, for Lady Anne, who died in 1637 without having borne the tenth Earl a son, had by 1636 borne him five daughters.

fathers; therefore my Lo: lett us runne in a straight line, without turnings and windings, as Henry Hottspurre would have it, when Mortimer and he devided England in a mappe.

Now my Lo: concerning your second demande, that I should assure all the land I have 2000^l excepted upon my sonne this demaund I hold also unreasonable and will never doe it soe long as I live: but soe mutche as is answerable to a portion of any nature as shall be offered, that I hold reasonable: for my Lo: thoughe the beauty of your dawghter fettered my sonne, good my Lo: doe not thinke to shackell me with 12000^l, whereas if mony were the marke I only shott at, I could easily carve my selfe of that somme out of 200000^l that I have at myne own disposing. Your Lo: is but a stranger to me and perhappes knowes me not to be one of theas harche natures as they call me; and doe they thinke that I will so easely put out of my hands the power god hathe putt into, and make myselfe a slave to my Sonne? No no my Lord, yow will finde that I canne as easely leave a sonne as a sonne can leave a father; and that I know very well where the strength of obedience lieth. But perhaps somme that seeketh to heape all uppon him and thinkes the sweetnes of his nature lies fitter for the moing than myne doeth, are apt to perswade yow to theas demands; when they consider not, that I may marry againe, then must ther be portions for other children, jointers for a wyfe, a sonne in being must be cared for, brothers I have many if I list to enlarge ther meanes, grandchildren I am not without, and my Lo: the sinewes of my arme are not soe stiffe but that I may venture to give a bloe for the service of my cuntry, and by chaunce becomeme a prisoner, shall I be beholding to my sonne for my ransomme; or if I shall be in debt shall I stand to his award: Thus your Lo: sees what I am resolved in theas two points: if theas yow pleas to lay aside yow may treat of the rest, if not lay them by, it is but labor to treate farther; and soe not giving your Lo: farther trooble, I rest your Lo: to dispose of

Petworth this 29 January.

[Edd. 1609]

[Holograph]

HELEN E. SANDISON.

AN IMPORTANT SMOLLETT LETTER

A LONG-FORGOTTEN letter by Tobias Smollett has been called to my attention through the kindness of Mr. A. F. Falconer, of Oxford, who came upon it in *The New Jamaica Magazine* (February, 1799, pp. 115-116) in the Bodleian Library. There appears to be no information concerning the original manuscript, but the letter is undoubtedly authentic. When printed in 1799 it was described as "an original letter from the late celebrated doctor Smollet to a friend in this island." I am not certain to whom Smollett was

writing, but I suggest that it was Thomas Bontein, who assisted the novelist in conducting his financial interests in the West Indies, and who was named by Smollett ten years after the date of this correspondence as one of the executors of his will.

This letter, written at the end of 1759, reveals Smollett's bitterness over the numerous attacks which had been made against him during his first three years' experience with the *Critical Review*. It proves, moreover, how precarious his health was during that year. And finally it discloses another of his many humanitarian interests, and brings to light his long friendship with Charles Bell, a relationship about which nothing has hitherto been known.

The subjoined text follows *The New Jamaica Magazine* with no alteration of any sort :

DEAR SIR,

"Procrastination (says a very gloomy author) is the thief of time"; and in this particular he says well: I know it by experience, and plead guilty, as an accomplice of the felon. As you observe, I owe you a long letter, and many other favours for which I shall always be in your debt. This, you will say, is the natural situation of an author. If I go on writing as I have proceeded for some years, my hand will be paralytic, and my brain dried to a snuff. I would not wish my greatest enemy a greater curse than the occupation of an author, in which capacity I have toiled myself into an habitual asthma, and been baited like a bear by all the hounds of Grub-street. Some people have flourished by imputed wit; I have suffered by imputed dullness. I have been abused, reviled, and calumniated, for satires I never saw; I have been censured for absurdities of which I could not possibly be guilty. But lest you should have reason to curse a correspondence which teems of nothing but disagreeable complaints, I will release you from the subject. We have received your last remittance per bill upon Sir Alexander Grant,¹ which was duly honoured, and likewise your subsequent intimation of a further remittance in silver, shipped on board of the Assistance. I need not tell you how welcome these tidings have been; but it is my duty to tell you, that all of us retain the most grateful sense of the kind attention you have given to our little affairs. Mrs. Leaver,² who seems to have renewed her age like the eagle, is full of your praise; my wife is not silent on the subject and you may be sure my heart will not fail to do you justice. Accept of their best compliments, joined to mine, presented to you and Mrs. —; to your brother Alick and his partner, as also to your brother William. I shall write to the doctor by this opportunity. We have resolved, in compliance with your advice, to send

¹ Sir Alexander Grant became baronet in 1755 and was M.P. for the Inverness Burghs 1761-8.

² Mrs. Leaver, Smollett's mother-in-law, was residing at this time with the Smolletts. She died in 1762, aged 71, and was buried in Old Chelsea Church.

over a power for selling the negroes, and to transmit it by our old friend Charles Sutty, who is now bound for your island.

After having thus discussed my own business, give me leave to say something in behalf of a friend. You doubtless remember Charles —, ¹ with whom I have lived these eighteen years in the most unreserved intimacy. He has been governor at Cape Coast, where he acquitted himself nobly, and is going back to the same place in the same character. I know him to be one of the best men that ever were born, and I love him with the warmest affection. He tells me his elder brother has fled from domestic unhappiness to your island, and begs me to recommend him to your good offices. He knows not well what scheme of life to pursue, and therefore will require your advice and direction: Need I add, that whatever civilities you shew him, I shall consider as kindnesses done to my own brother. He sailed from Scotland, and will have been some time in Jamaica before this comes to hand. I think he was bred to the Scotch law; but as that is not practised in our colonies, I fancy he will be fit for nothing but a clerk, or an overseer.

I flatter myself with the hopes of being happy in seeing your brothers Alick and Tom in England; but I am grieved to find you determined upon a longer stay in the West Indies. I know not how you may feel; but I perceive myself going down hill apace, and promise myself but a few years of enjoyment; I would therefore make the most of my time, and eagerly wish to see my friends about me. To tell you a secret, my constitution is quite broken: Since last May, I have hardly enjoyed one day of health: I am so subject to colds and rheums that I dare hardly stir from my own house; and shall be obliged to give up all the pleasures of society, at least those of tavern society, to which you know I have been always addicted.

The people here are in high spirits on account of our successes, and Mr. Pitt is so popular, that I may venture to say all party is extinguished in Great-Britain: That Minister is certainly in this respect the most surprising phenomenon that ever appeared in our hemisphere: If he had broke the spell by which we are bewitched to the continent, I would have pronounced him the greatest man that ever lived.

I have nothing more to say at present, but that I am, my dear friend,
your most affectionate and
obliged humble servant,

T. SMOLLETT

Chelsea,
Dec. 10, 1759

LEWIS M. KNAPP.

¹ Charles —, governor at Cape Coast, was Charles Bell. I am indebted to the Assistant Librarian at the Colonial Office for informing me that, according to the list of Governors of the Possessions on the Gold Coast, a Mr. Charles Bell served as governor in 1756-7 and again in 1761-3. It is worth noting that Smollett praised Bell's administrative courage and discretion in his *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, ii. (1760), p. 236.

REVIEWS

Boswell's Life of Johnson. Edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, revised by L. F. POWELL. In six volumes. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1934. Vol. i., *The Life (1709-1765)*, pp. xlviii+556; vol. ii., *The Life (1766-1776)*, pp. viii+543; vol. iii., *The Life (1776-1780)*, pp. viii+541; vol. iv., *The Life (1780-1784)*, pp. viii+557. Six volumes (subscription price), 5 guineas net; in three volumes on India paper (subscription price), 5 guineas net. Vols. i.-iv., separately, 4 guineas net; vols. i.-iv., in two volumes on India paper, 4 guineas net.

It is customary when a substantial piece of editing appears to say that no further edition will be necessary for many years to come. It is customary and polite to say so; but it is rarely true. Fifty years is a long life for a "standard" edition, and few survive even half that time without provoking a great deal of grumbling among scholars and protests that it is high time we had something a little more up to date. But there are one or two honourable exceptions. It is now almost fifty years since Dr. Birkbeck Hill's four-volume edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* appeared—it was published in 1887—and it is still in regular use among scholars. It was, and still is, a model of patient and informative editing: what the reader wants to know he generally finds in Birkbeck Hill, and what he already knows, or is never likely to want to know, is not there to annoy him. Since its first appearance all quotations from Boswell's *Life* have been made by reference to its pages, and it would be a great nuisance indeed if it were to be superseded; it has become, in fact, a literary monument that must be preserved. At the same time, partly owing to the discovery of new material, such as the invaluable *Boswell Papers*, and partly, as Mr. Powell points out, to the stimulus of Dr. Hill's own scholarly work, there has been a very remarkable activity in Johnson studies since 1887. A new edition was called for; but in this case demolition of the old was out of the question, and the business of the new editor was to modernize where necessary but to keep the original structure intact, even to the extent of retaining the pagination of the original.

This task, entrusted to Mr. L. F. Powell, has been carried out with unselfish devotion and unwearied research. He has his reward, of course: he was working on one of the world's great books, his name must now always be associated with it, and he has the scholar's satisfaction of having thrown light on many dark corners. But he has done all this for an adopted child; he knew when he started that he was going to produce an edition of an edition. Coming after Dr. Hill, too, must have been a thankless task, rather like picking blackberries in the afternoon when someone else has cleaned the bushes in the morning. Nevertheless, he has added to his predecessor's work very considerably. He has, like Dr. Hill, adopted the third edition as the basis of his text, but he has collated it with the first and second editions; all variants from the third edition adopted in the text are accompanied by a textual note. Boswell's misquotations from letters and other sources are left undisturbed in the text, but where the new editor has been able to consult the original he gives the true reading in a note. This textual work in itself, together with the checking of Dr. Hill's notes and the verifying of his references, was a formidable task; but Mr. Powell has done much more than that. The discovery some years ago of Boswell's journals and private papers, the bibliographical work of W. P. Courtney and Professor D. Nichol Smith, the work of Professor C. B. Tinker and Professor F. A. Pottle on Boswell, Dr. R. W. Chapman's edition of Johnson's *Journey to the Western Islands* and of Boswell's *Tour*, the biographical researches of Mr. A. L. Reade—to name only some of the most important contributions to Johnson studies—have placed at the disposal of Johnson's editor a mass of new material. Availing himself of this fresh information, and supplementing it continually with his own researches, Mr. Powell has been able to elucidate many references in the *Life* which necessarily remained obscure to Dr. Hill. In particular he has been able to identify many of the persons intentionally concealed by Boswell behind a veiled reference to "a clergyman," "a gentleman of my acquaintance," and so on; and he has often been able to comment informatively on some of the obscurer people named by Boswell. Perhaps the best idea of the thoroughness of Mr. Powell's inquiries is to be gained from his list of acknowledgments at the beginning of the first volume.

One of the most serious problems that an editor has to decide is how far he should allow his commentary to go. What is relevant, and what—though interesting in itself—must be left out? The

editor of Johnson is in a happy position here ; for even scraps and snippets about him have their value merely because they are about him, and to some extent the same is true of Boswell. But there is a danger line all the same, and Mr. Powell sometimes comes very near to it. Writing to Johnson in 1777 (vol. iii., p. 103), Sir Alexander Dick said he had been told that Sir Archibald Grant of Monymusk in Aberdeenshire had planted more than fifty million trees on his estate. Fifty million is a lot of trees, and Mr. Powell was naturally sceptical. It is characteristic of his thoroughness that he should proceed to investigate the possibility of planting so many trees in an estate of about fifteen thousand acres, and he has called in the aid of the present owner of Monymusk and of an expert on forestry, besides consulting contemporary records ; but it is surely doubtful if the point is worth so much space as he gives it. His note takes up more than a page in the appendix (vol. iii., p. 486-8). Whether fifty million is an excessive figure or not, the important fact is that a quite remarkable number of trees were planted at Monymusk, and that is a fact that no one disputes. It is not often, however, that Mr. Powell fails to see the wood for counting so assiduously the trees. One small point that may annoy the reader is a lack of uniformity in giving references, e.g. the *Boswell Papers* are sometimes cited on the same page as "*Boswell Papers*," "*Boswell Papers*, ed. Pottle" (or "ed. G. Scott"), "Lt.-Col. Isham's *Boswell Papers*," and "Lt.-Col. Ralph Isham's *Boswell Papers*." I have had no luck in discovering errors of fact, though "Dr. T. B. Simpson" (vol. i., p. xxii) is apparently a misprint for "Dr. W. D. Simpson." A small slip of Dr. Hill's (vol. iv., p. 307) remains uncorrected. In a note to the verses by David Lewis, *While Malice, Pope, denies thy page etc.*, which Pope inserted in later editions of the *Dunciad*, it is stated that they were first published in a Collection of Pieces on Occasion of the *Dunciad*, 1732. On the contrary, they had already appeared three years before in the so-called "Second Edition, with some Additional Notes" of the *Dunciad* (1729).

Mr. Powell has made a notable contribution to twentieth-century scholarship ; it is enough to say that his work would have satisfied Dr. Hill and that he has earned the gratitude of all Johnson's friends.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

Surrey's "Fourth Boke of Virgill." Edited with Introduction, Variant Readings, and Notes by HERBERT HARTMAN. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. xxviii + 54 + Facsimiles. 18s. net.

THIS careful edition of Surrey's blank verse translation of *Aeneid IV*, as printed by John Day for the obscure London bookseller William Owen, fulfils a need that has been keenly felt for many years by students of early Tudor poetry. They will be duly grateful to Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer for allowing it to be prepared from the unique copy of the original edition now in his library and to Mr. Hartman for his judicious and accurate work as editor.

In attempting to discuss within the limits of a twenty-page introduction all the problems to which the Day-Owen text of Surrey's translation gives rise, Mr. Hartman was obliged to pass summarily over many points that it would have been more useful to treat in detail. For instance, his treatment of the interrelations of the three extant versions—the Day-Owen, which can hardly have been printed before 1554, Tottell's *Certain Bokes of Virgiles Aeneas* (1557), and B. M. Hargrave MS. 205, dating probably from the early years of Elizabeth's reign—is distinctly less full and suggestive than Miss Willcock's discussion (*M.L.R.* xiv., xv., and xvii). On the main question of the authenticity of the Day-Owen text compared with the "improved" versions of Tottell and the Hargrave scribe, his well-marshalled arguments and aptly-chosen illustrations establish more firmly than ever the conclusion reached by Miss Willcock, that, whatever its date of printing, the Day-Owen text is undoubtedly the nearest of the three to Surrey's original script.

Mr. Hartman, while stating the case for a later date very fairly, agrees with Miss Willcock in accepting late 1554 as the most likely date for the printing of Day's edition. But the effect of his discussion is to leave the question even more open than it was after Dr. Merrill, in reply to Miss Willcock's arguments, had shown that a fair case could be made out for a date as late as 1559 (*The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, pp. 369-373). Until more has been learnt about Day's activities between 1554 and 1557 it would be inadvisable to assign the Day-Owen edition definitely to 1554.

Mr. Hartman is, of course, on strong ground in arguing that Surrey wrote his blank verse translations before Grimald, two of whose attempts appeared in the first edition of Tottell's *Songes and*

Sonettes (June 5, 1557); his discovery that the original of one of Grimald's blank verse translations was not published until 1548, a year after Surrey's death, makes this contention to all intents and purposes certain. On the other hand, the evidence he advances of the popularity of Surrey's translation—whether in the Day-Owen version, Tottell's *Certain Bookes*, or in manuscript—and hence, of its direct influence on later writers of blank verse, amounts to very little.

On Surrey's use of the "straunge metre" of blank verse Mr. Hartman's views coincide with those of most modern scholars who have worked over the problem. He concludes that Surrey's translation, "more particularly in Owen's least tampered-with text, belongs to the tradition and idiom of flexible, accentual pentameter which mark him as Wyatt's disciple and continuator, rather than to the vogue for syllabic exactness which characterized the third quarter of the century" and which renders the Tottell and Hargrave texts practically valueless as indications of what Surrey originally wrote.

Perhaps the most valuable and certainly the most contentious part of Mr. Hartman's Introduction is his discussion of Surrey's debt to other translators of Vergil—especially Gavin Douglas and the Italians, Liburnio and Piccolomini. Developing a suggestion of Professor Berdan's, to the effect that an educated Englishman of the early sixteenth century would be more familiar with Latin than with any foreign vernacular and would be more likely to turn to a Latin original for help in interpreting a foreign vernacular than *vice versa*, Mr. Hartman builds up an impressive case for the theory that the parallels, noted by G. F. Nott and others, between Surrey's text and the versions of Douglas and the Italians, originated in their use of a common source, the *Commentary* of the grammarian Servius. Students will be grateful to him for his suggestive treatment of this problem, but that many will follow him in accepting recourse by the various translators to Servius or any other Vergilian commentator as an adequate explanation of the host of parallels that can be pointed out in their works, is most unlikely.

It is impossible on historical grounds to concede Mr. Hartman's further point that, since it can be shown that the early sixteenth-century translators of Vergil—Italian, Scottish, and English alike—"used some conventional annotated text of the *Æneid*," it necessarily follows that Surrey's blank verse was evolved without any

reference to the experiments in unrhymed heroic verse that were being made by the humanists of contemporary Italy. The assumption underlying this argument, that in the England of Henry VIII there existed what Mr. Hartman calls a "strictly English humanism" independent of the culture of Italy and the literary experiments there being undertaken, is contradicted by the facts.

Thus, although it cannot be said that Mr. Hartman has solved all the problems raised by this important text, he has nevertheless, perhaps in a way he did not quite intend, brought some of them appreciably nearer solution. He has, moreover, supplied the material for a fuller examination than has hitherto been possible of the "smoothing" in Tottell's *Certain Bokes* and its relation to the "editing" of Surrey's poems in *Songes and Sonettes*; and, more important still, by his accurate text and compendious notes he has laid the foundation for a more exact study of the origin and development of English blank verse.

The text faithfully reproduces the spelling and punctuation of the facsimile, "except for inverted letters and the majuscules I/J and U/V." A few readings, where the facsimile is blurred, may be disputed and one or two are obviously incorrect—e.g. *such* for *suche*, l. 122; *shypps* for *shyps*, l. 536; *as*, clearly printed in the facsimile, has dropped out of l. 708; the facsimile reads *sayle* not *sayle* in l. 720; *they* for *theyr* in l. 775 is a more serious error. The collations of the Tottell and Hargrave texts are a model of good sense and accuracy; merely orthographical variants as such are not listed, but the punctuation of both versions and the idiosyncrasies of the Hargrave scribe are retained.

The notes are intended mainly to illustrate the "editing" and "especially the decasyllabizing" which had befallen the original text by the time it emerged from the hands of Tottell's editor and the scribe of the Hargrave manuscript. They also give frequent references to Vergil's text, quotations from Servius' *Commentary*, where that work appears to have influenced Surrey, parallels in the translations of Gavin Douglas and Liburnio, and allusions to important points in the work of Miss Willcock and Professor Padel-ford. There is no index. In the first footnote on page xi, for pp. 47-52 read pp. 43-47; also in the collations relating to line 830, on page 49, the word *to* is incorrectly stated to be absent from Tottell's version.

H. J. BYROM.

The Axiochus of Plato translated by Edmund Spenser.

Edited by F. M. PADELFORD. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. Pp. x+80. 12s. 6d. net.

If ever Spenser had read Montaigne's essays, a confession which the latter makes must have made him smile: "Quant je me treuve desgousté de l'*Axioche* de Platon, comme d'un ouvrage sans force, en égard à un tel aucteur, mon iugement ne s'en croit pas." Spenser's translation was first noted in the catalogue of the Harleian Library, but accredited, as every Spenserian knows, to one "Edw. Spenser 1592." It was known to Upton and probably to Steevens, but later notices, by Herbert, Todd, and others, are certainly derivative. The copy in Harley's Library passed out of sight, and some later editors have doubted its existence, although the work was entered regularly in the *Stationers' Register* in 1592. In 1931 Messrs. Heffer advertised a copy of the 1679 folio of Spenser, containing a copy of this work, incorrectly described as a duodecimo. Professor Padelford secured it. The present writer wonders how many, like himself, noticed the item, and just did not have sufficient presence of mind to buy it. For the copy, though possibly not that formerly in the Harleian Library, is now unique.

Professor Padelford gives it back to us in facsimile. The Harleian Catalogue ascription to "Edw. Spenser" is correct, since that is the author's name as it appears on the title-page, while there is a reference in the publisher's epistle to the reader to "that worthy Scholler and Poet, Maister *Edward Spenser*." There is no doubt that the poet is intended. Cuthbert Burbie, the publisher, was obviously aware of Spenser's reputation as a poet, but did not know his Christian name, or for the moment had forgotten it. Spenser's name, moreover, had not then appeared in full on any title-page, simply as "Ed. Sp." "Ed. Spenser," or "E.S.," while as late as 1599 the commendatory sonnet, "The antique *Babel*, Empresse of the East," prefixed to the English translation by Lewis Lewkenor of Cardinal Gaspari Contarini's *The Commonwealth and Gouvernement of Venice*, is signed "Edw. Spenser." So there is nothing alarming in the claim that "Edward" Spenser is the poet and if we accept the sonnet, as we all do, we must accept the present work.¹

¹ [Cf. *D.N.B.* art. Edmund Coote, *fl.* 1597, for a similar mistake of "Edward" for "Edmund."—*Ed. R.E.S.*]

Professor Padelford finds no direct evidence for the date of the translation, but I agree with his surmises that it was of very early date, and before *The Shepheardes Calendar*. Possibly it was a school piece of translation, or begun as such, but in any case not earlier than 1568, in which year the version which he translated appeared. It thus may belong to the last few months of his school career or to the first months of his University life. Doubts of later composition are suggested to my mind purely because of the poverty of the English verse translations of some lines from Homer. These are much nearer the *Theatre of Worldlings* than *The Shepheardes Calendar*. But, as Professor Padelford points out, with examples, words and phrases used in the translation of the dialogue recur through Spenser's poetry down to the last.

The translation was made from the Greek and Latin edition of the *Axiochus* prepared by Rayanus Welsdalius in 1568, one of a long list of editions by various editors which Professor Padelford has discovered, and now records for the first time. He studied eleven of these in detail, including two French translations, to see which Spenser had used, a work of patient scholarship which one admires. Welsdalius presented both Greek and Latin texts, but Spenser primarily used the Latin text. Professor Padelford gives a facsimile of the text used by Spenser. That he kept an eye on the Greek is, I think, proved by his putting into the crude verses mentioned above, three, or perhaps there are four, quotations from Homer, which, in verse in the Greek text, appear as prose in the Latin text. This point is not mentioned by Professor Padelford, but he can hardly have overlooked it. The verses are not likely to be hailed. The second couplet runs

Of all that in the earth are ordained by nature,
Than man, is not to bee found a more wretched creature.

With an effort one recognizes these as six-foot lines with double rhymes. The others are of the same quality. They are, in fact, far worse than anything in the *Theatre of Worldlings*. Incidentally, in his quotation of the above couplet on page 28, Professor Padelford omits the comma after "man," and in a second quotation misprints "reache" as "reach."

This does not conclude the work done on the translation, for Professor Osgood published in April, 1934, a paper on "Verse in Spenser's Prose," a study of rhythmical patterns in this work and the *View of the Present State of Ireland*, in *ELH: A Journal of*

English Literary History, the journal of the Tudor and Stuart Club, Baltimore.

Unfortunately one promise on the title-page of the translation is not carried out by the unique copy: "Heereto is annexed a sweet speech or Oration, spoken at the Tryumphe at White-hall before her Maiestie, by the Page to the right noble Earle of Oxenforde." This is missing, nor has Professor Padelford found the "Tryumphe" at which it could have been presented. Burbie's title-page does not accredit this oration to Spenser, but one is tempted to think of it as by him, and to wonder if we have recovered one lost work, only to find that we have lost another.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

Godes Peace and the Queenes. VICISSITUDES OF A HOUSE 1539-1615. By NORREYS JEPHSON O'CONOR. London: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. xii+154. 8s. 6d. net.

WHEN collecting information concerning his Norreys ancestors, Mr. O'Connor was informed by Professor Leslie Hotson of a suit brought by Sir John Norreys against the Earl of Lincoln, and investigation of the indexes to the Star Chamber proceedings brought to light other suits in which Lincoln and the Norreyses were involved. The story told by these documents is the basis of his book, but Mr. O'Connor has filled in the gaps from other sources and has thus incidentally provided us with an interesting history of the manor of Weston-on-the-green in Oxfordshire and with useful biographies of Lord Williams of Thame, of Lord Norreys, father of the famous Sir John Norreys, and of the eccentric Henry, second earl of Lincoln. The major series of documents describes a raid by the Earl of Lincoln upon Weston. Mr. O'Connor has skilfully arranged his materials to form a connected narrative and he allows the witnesses to speak in their own words. The result is that the reader feels that these scenes come to him direct from the source, as indeed they do. The book is a valuable store of everyday Elizabethan English and extremely informative on countless details of daily life, such as the manner of country justices in dealing with a difficult situation.

From another suit is derived an account of an interlude performed on a village green in Lincolnshire in 1601. It was written by one Talboys Dymoke and contained a caricature of the Earl of

Lincoln. This description by eyewitnesses of the May games at Kyme, of the libellous interlude and matters connected with it, is obviously of the greatest interest and importance to students of English folk-lore and drama. Particularly curious are the references to the mysterious "book of Mab" from which was taken a text for a mock sermon which opened with the following profane prayer: "The Marcie of Musterd seed and the blessinge of Bull-beefe and the peace of Pottelucke be with you all. Amen." The rhyme (p. 123) in which animal names for people are used and the key to them given in the evidence reminds one of Nashe's use of animal names, of Harvey's queer verses in *A New Letter* about the "bull-beggar" of the town, and of the fox, the ape, and the humble-bee in *Love's Labour's Lost*. The allusion to "Henry of Bullingbroke" (p. 120) is also odd. Mr. O'Connor dismisses the "Mab" problem by quoting from W. J. Thoms's *Three Notelets on Shakespeare* a doubtful theory concerning the Irish derivation of the name; this and other points require far more careful study than he has devoted to them. Professor C. J. Sisson, whose researches into the Star Chamber suits have borne and are bearing so much fruit, dealt with this Lincoln-Dymoke play in a public lecture at University College, London, on February 27, 1934. But of that Mr. O'Connor, whose book was published in October of the same year, has not heard. It is only fair to add, however, that it is for the light thrown on the Earl of Lincoln that he is chiefly interested in the play, rather than for its importance to students of the drama.

There are occasional errors in placing the numbers of the note-references in the text. On p. 99, note 247 applies to the sentence before the one against which it is placed.

FRANCES A. YATES.

The Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse. Chosen by H. J. C. GRIERSON and J. BULLOUGH. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. xiv+974. 8s. 6d. net.

If ever the names of publisher and editors guaranteed the excellence of an anthology, they surely do so for the *Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse*. Professor Grierson and Mr. Bullough have seen to it that this book is as good as the best of the series to which it belongs, and it is well designed to satisfy both the ordinary reader and those who judge it with some specialized knowledge of the period.

Looked at from the former's point of view, here is a collection, produced in a pleasant and workmanlike format, of more than 600 pieces, representing more than a hundred authors; enough is given of the greater writers to reveal pretty thoroughly the character of their work (in round numbers, out of 950 pages of text, Drayton gets 30, Donne 60, Jonson 30, Herrick 30, Herbert 30, Milton 100, Crashaw 35, Cowley 25, Marvell 30, Vaughan 30, Dryden 60), while the net is cast wide enough among the minor poets and anonymous pieces to give a very good idea of the general character of seventeenth-century verse. Spelling and punctuation have been so adjusted as to secure that no peculiarity will trouble eyes unused to seventeenth-century texts, while nothing foreign to seventeenth-century practice is introduced. And the general reader may rest assured that the selection is indeed an excellent one, that the texts have been most carefully edited, and that the spelling and punctuation before him are not an unnatural hybrid.

As for those who take a special interest in seventeenth-century verse, they too will learn something from this volume. For though an anthology is in some ways an unsatisfactory thing to a scholar, it does reveal what might otherwise pass unnoticed or unrealized—not merely stray poems gathered from unfamiliar sources, but affinities and resemblances which are brought out by juxtaposition. For instance, on the first page of this book we read "The Flood that did, and dreadful Fire that shall . . ."; those who know Donne will immediately recall his line "All whom the flood did, and fire shall o'erthrow." The thought is more or less of a commonplace; the grammatical similarity of the expression is striking—striking enough to suggest an "influence." Yet it must be a coincidence. Neither Fulke Greville's *Cælica* (in which the former line occurs) nor Donne's *Poems* was published till 1633, by which time both poets were dead—a warning to those who would always infer influence from similarity.

Not only for little things like this, but as a text-book out of which to illustrate the development and the richness of the verse of a century, this anthology will be valued by students. Its scholarly worth is such that their criticism cannot well consist of more than a few cavils on points where the choice of matter or of text does not suit their personal predilections.

First, as to omissions. It is a pity that the scheme of the book demands the exclusion of Raleigh and Sir John Davies, and that

the selection from Drayton is confined to his later work. It seems unnatural to find selections from Fulke Greville's *Cælica* and nothing from *Nosce Teipsum*. But the dividing line must be arbitrary, and when the dividing line is arbitrary, such results will follow. Within the century, however, are one or two omissions which may be regretted. Something might be rescued from Hoskins' remains; Patrick Carey (as readers of Saintsbury's *Caroline Poets* will remember) left religious and secular verse which deserves inclusion; William Walsh figures in the *Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse*, but his *Poems and Letters Amorous and Gallant* appeared in the 1690's, and it is odd that he should be quite unrepresented here. It is harder to justify criticism of omissions of individual pieces from authors otherwise represented; but of first-rate poems I miss Donne's *The Autumnall* and *The Undertaking* (for which I could have spared both *The Message* and *The Prohibition*), Vaughan's *The Timber* and Cowley's *The Chronicle*: only two love poems from *The Mistress* appear here, to which *The Soul* and *The Frailty* (in which Cowley reaches a standard worthy of Donne) might well have been added. William Strode is only represented by his well-known poem about Cloris in the Snow: *Westwell Downs* and *In Commendation of Music* (each a better poem than "Cloris") are absent. Room, too, might have been found for Cleveland's remarkable *Mark Antony* "Night piece." Finally, generous though the space allotted to Dryden is, no room is found for *The Secular Masque*.

As to the dating of the contents: each piece is followed by the date of the first edition, with an indication of the other source (if any) from which the text is taken. It is important that the source of the text should be given; but the date of the first edition, where it is not the source of the text, seems irrelevant, and I should prefer to see in every case the source of the text, together with the date of composition, or a *terminus ante quem* for composition, where composition long precedes the date of the text-version. The text of all Cowley's pieces is taken from the 1668 folio, and yet the only references subjoined are to the first editions. Why the 1668 version is preferred is not quite clear. For the pieces which it includes, the *Works* of 1656 is generally a better authority; and 1647 is sometimes to be preferred to either 1656 or 1668 for *The Mistress* poems. So, in No. 467 of the *Oxford Book*, 1647 includes a line in st. 3 which 1656 omits by a pure error, an error copied in 1668.

The stanza here appears in its truncated form, yet 1647, which contains the necessary line, is given as the authority for this faulty text. In No. 468, 1647 gives an exclamation mark at the end of l. 4 which there is no reason to follow 1668 in omitting. In No. 469 "*the Bombast Way*" (1668) is preferred by the Oxford editors to "*th' Oxford Way*" (1656), though I suspect that Cowley was not responsible for the change. On p. 703 in the penultimate stanza of the Hervey Ode "Cast'st" is read as from 1689 ("wheresoere thou cast'st thy view"), and "cast" is said to be the reading of 1656. In fact 1656 and 1668 (according to my copies) read "casts" and I should suspect that this is the true form. If the text of the Crashaw elegy is carefully studied, I think it will be agreed that in the few places where they differ, the 1656 version is to be preferred to the 1668 version (here followed). These, of course (apart from the omitted line), are trifles; but all would have been avoided if the best or earliest text had been followed.

Another poem where reference is only made to a later text is Mayne's elegy on Ben Jonson. One wonders why the *Parnassus Biceps* version was preferred to the earlier, more authentic, text of *Jonsonus Virbius*. Jonson himself is cheated of a line in No. 104 (*To Penshurst*): "A fortune in this age but rarely known" has dropped out before the last line on p. 161.

The selection from King is a good one. It appears that the text of his elegy on Charles I was taken from the 1664 edition, so that the reference to the separate publication of 1649 is misleading; the texts are so nearly identical that no harm is done, but I think "Text from *Poems* 1664, written 1649" would be a better reference. And it is not quite clear why the text of No. 274 (King's *Vow-breaker*) is not taken from the *Poems* of 1657 (which, though unauthorized, is an exceedingly sound text) rather than from one of the two anthologies in which it appeared in the previous year.

A careful examination of the text of the large selection from Donne reveals little or nothing that calls for criticism. I do not know why "aiery" should be thought more congenial to modern eyes than "ayery" in the *Valediction: forbidding mourning*. And more than one MS. reads "Drawes my circle just" (an attractive variant) for "makes my circle just" in the last line of that poem, though "one MS." alone is credited with it in the note. *The Extasie*, of course, is given in full. I think apostrophes should be printed in the line "They are ours, though they are not wee, wee

are"—in conformity with practice if not with authority. On the other hand, the apostrophe now for the first time inserted in the penultimate line of No. 70 (*His Picture*: "Did nurse it: Who now 'is growne strong enough") spoils the metre, unless "nurse" is to be made a dissyllable (some early texts, I see, read "nourish").

It is pleasant to see a good selection from Godolphin. One amusing textual point arises in his strange *Reply* (No. 403). The editors refer for their text to Malone MS. 13 and *Tixall Poetry*. The only point where the Tixall text makes itself felt, and which alone, therefore, justifies the reference to *Tixall Poetry*, is in the following lines:

I fear not her discerning breast
should be with other love imprest,
Be to the proud resign'd a prey,
or to the loud, or to the gay.

M. reads "or to the lovd," which is impossible. But I do not regard "loud" as either an emendation of Clifford, the Tixall editor, or as a proof that his MS. read "loud": he modernized the spelling throughout, and "lovd" would no doubt be read by him as, and appear as, "loud" automatically. "Loud" and "lov'd" both seem impossible: the former for its insistent and inopportune rhyme with "proud," the latter (kept by Mr. Dighton in his text of Godolphin) for the sense. May not "lewd" (the reading of the Drinkwater MS.) be right? The confusion of "loud" and "lewd" can be matched elsewhere in seventeenth-century MSS. But if "loud" is preferred, I think the Oxford editors deserve credit for it as an emendation of their own, and that reference to the Tixall text is supererogatory.

Incidentally, in the reference just mentioned, *Tixall Poetry* is misprinted *Tixall Poets*. *Justa* is misprinted *Juxta* on p. 612.

These two misprints,¹ and the handful of textual trivialities noted above, are all that could be found in the course of a fairly detailed examination of large portions of the book, conducted for the special, if ungracious, purpose of finding something to say by way of criticism. The scantiness of the crop is, I hope, better testimony to the merits of this excellent book than several columns of vague laudation.

JOHN SPARROW.

¹ I suspect that "Fame," at the end of st. 1 of No. 458 is another; and reference to Mr. Wilkinson's minute textual apparatus of Lovelace suggests that something is wrong with the Oxford editors' note on this stanza.

John Milton's "Epitaphium Damonis" printed from the First Edition with a new translation by Walter W. Skeat (e Coll. Christ.). Cambridge: at the University Press. 1933. Pp. 21. 2s. 6d. net.

"THIS translation of Milton's commemoration of his friend Charles Diodati," writes Dr. A. W. Pollard in his short note, "was made as a tribute to Sir Israel Gollancz by one of his oldest friends, son of the late Professor W. W. Skeat, his chief teacher at Cambridge. In the belief that the tribute is one with which Sir Israel would have been especially pleased, the friends who formed a committee to honour his memory have caused it to be printed, primarily for distribution to the subscribers to the memorial." The Latin text accompanying the translation is that of what appears to be the first edition, undated and anonymous, and only recently entered in the British Museum Catalogue under Milton's name.

Mr. Skeat, who many years ago was "proxime accessit" for the Chancellor's English medal at Cambridge and whose capital renderings from Greek lyric poets are known to some in manuscript, has evidently lingered lovingly over the present work, which is marked by faithfulness and great delicacy of touch. The measure is that of *Lycidas*, and Miltonic words and expressions are at times not dragged in but naturally introduced, as "in that forgetful deep" (*Lethæo . . . sub Orco*).

There are happy instances of what may be called grammatical change, so often neglected in translation. *Thamesina per oppida* being rendered "By citted Thames"; *nostri memor ibis ad astra* becoming "Remember me upon thy starward way!" To compress an English version into the same number of lines as a Latin original is not possible for long. Here two hundred and nineteen Latin correspond to two hundred and eighty-eight English. At times there may be a little expansion in the rendering, but such expansion is not unjustifiable. Who can complain that *silvisque vocabere Damon* has the equivalent of "Thou'll still be Damon to our woods below"? "Peaks hung aloft in heaven" is a fair translation of *æreas rupes*, while "Hark! to the hazels 'Tityrus' summons rings!" avoids the awkwardness of a plain literal rendering for *Tityrus ad corylos vocat*. The following extracts when compared with Milton's Latin will give a fair view of the faithfulness and success of Mr. Skeat's work:

Pectora cui credam ? quis me lenire docebit
 Mordaces curas, quis longam fallere noctem
 Dulcibus alloquiis, grato cum sibilat igni
 Molle pyrum, et nucibus strepitat focus, at malus auster
 Miscet cuncta foris, et desuper intonat ulmo ?
 Ite domum impasti, domino iam non vacat, agni.

To whom now trust my heart ?—Who'll teach me how
 To deaden eating care,
 Or with sweet converse low
 The livelong watches of the night to snare,
 When juicy pears hiss mid the genial glow
 And crackle of chestnuts on the hearth resounds ?
 Without, the felon South with sky confounds
 The earth, and on the elm his thunder sounds !
 Home, lambs, unfed ; no time for you have I !

O ego quantus eram gelidi cum stratus ad Arni
 Murmura, populeumque nemus, qua mollior herba,
 Carpere nunc violas, nunc summas carpere myrtos
 Et potui Lycidæ certantem audire Menalcam,
 Ipse etiam tentare ausus sum, nec puto multum
 Displicui, nam sunt et apud me munera vestra
 Fiscellæ, calathique, et cerea vincla cicutæ.

Oh, how transported was my mind, when I
 Outstretch'd beside cool Arno's whispering flow,
 In poplar glade, where tenderer grass doth grow,
 Could violets pluck—or pluck the myrtles high,
 And hear with Lycidas Menalcas vie !
 I too dar'd sing nor greatly fail'd to please,
 Methinks, since here—your gifts to me—are these
 Winebowls, and waxbound pipes, and basketry !—

E. BENSLY.

**A Minor Augustan, being the Life and Works of George,
 Lord Lyttleton, 1709-1773.** By ANANDA VITTAL RAO.
 Calcutta : The Book Company, Ltd. 1934. Pp. viii+387.
 12s. 6d. net.

" LORD LYTTLETON'S poems," writes Dr. Johnson in his *Lives of the Poets*, "are the works of a man of literature and judgment devoting part of his time to versification." Copies of his poetical works with Burney's delightful illustrations can still be found fairly frequently in second-hand booksellers' shops. They must have

been popular, as they passed through many editions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; but their vogue soon passed. The nineteenth-century critics were more interested in minor Elizabethan dramatists than in minor Augustan poets and the neo-Gothic movement found Palladian verse as distasteful as Palladian architecture. But the whirligig of time brings its revenges. The Augustans are coming back into favour, and lesser poets of the eighteenth century are being studied as carefully as the lesser contemporaries of Shakespeare were studied in the century of Lamb and Swinburne.

Lyttleton is not a great poet and not even a distinguished minor poet, but he is an excellent representative of an interesting and important phase of English life and literature. He is the perfect cultivated English aristocrat of the eighteenth century, the author of a number of readable works in verse and prose, the patron and friend of some great authors, a Whig statesman who was also a "patriot," and the creator of Hagley Park, that famous "landscape garden" which delighted Horace Walpole and probably played a considerable part in the development of romantic sensibility.

One way of treating such a figure is that adopted by Mr. S. C. Roberts in *An Eighteenth-century Gentleman* (Cambridge, 1930), where, in a few brilliant pages, by means of judicious selection and penetrating, half-ironic comment, the solemn, long-faced Whig with his enthusiasm for literature, liberty, and "nature," his conjugal affection, his piety, and his awkward manners is brought before us as a living man, just as we might encounter him in some sparkling canvas of Gainsborough or Raeburn.

The other method is to regard Lyttleton as the important "museum piece" that he certainly is, and to make him the subject of a complete and scholarly critical and biographical study. This is what Dr. A. V. Rao has done in his dissertation, accepted by the University of London for the degree of Ph.D. and now published under the title of *A Minor Augustan*.

Dr. Rao has performed his task in a workmanlike and straightforward way. He is not a brilliant writer, but he is the next best thing, and that is a writer who recognizes his own limitations and does not try to appear dazzling or profound. He has accumulated all the relevant materials, and has used them to construct a study of Lyttleton's life and writings in eleven chapters. There is a full account of Lyttleton's political career, critical reviews of his books,

details of his relations with Pope, Thomson, Fielding, Shenstone, Voltaire, and the Blue Stockings, and, in what is perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book, a useful description of Shenstone's landscape garden at Leasowes and Lyttleton's reconstruction of Hagley as a "*ferme ornée*" in the new manner in 1748.

Dr. Rao's literary criticism is not penetrating, but it is sensible and clearly and pleasantly expressed. He adopts the wise plan of quoting copiously, and it is unfortunate therefore that his quotations are often very carelessly transcribed. An ear for the rhythm of eighteenth-century verse and a little care in proof reading would have prevented him from ascribing to the correct Lyttleton such strange lines as "What shall I admire, which worthiest praise" (p. 31), "The *mistress* shall charm him in the *wife*" (p. 69), and "Her speech was the melodious warbling of the vernal grove" (p. 145). His estimate of the value of Lyttleton's writings is sane and well balanced. He resists the temptation to try to turn his goose into a swan, but his tempered eulogy of the *Monody*, the *Advice to a Lady* and some other pieces in verse and prose is well deserved, and ought to serve as a stimulus to send some readers at any rate to the pages of this forgotten but by no means contemptible writer.

Dr. Rao's book has two appendices. The first is a long bibliography of the kind usually appended to dissertations for higher degrees. When such dissertations are published as monographs these bibliographies should be mercilessly pruned. It is surely unnecessary to print, as Dr. Rao prints under the heading of "General Criticism," the names of all the stock works of reference that every student uses, such as *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Courthope's *History of English Poetry*, Elton's *Surveys*, etc. A short list of the authorities actually quoted in the text would surely be sufficient. If this part of Dr. Rao's bibliography is unnecessarily swollen, the second part consisting of a list of Lyttleton's own published works might have been more detailed. Thus it would be of real interest to the serious student of the eighteenth century to find the complete titles of works published during the author's lifetime instead of such disappointing entries as "'The Progress of Love' in four eclogues, 1732, second edition, 1732." The second appendix contains selections from Lyttleton's unpublished writings. They include a holograph poem "Written in a Gentleman's Coke upon Lyttleton" and some letters. There

seems to be an error in the transcription of the poem. In Dr. Rao's printed versions the tenth line reads incomprehensibly: "When I in fun grow old."

The last of the letters was well worth printing for the sake of the account of the gamekeeper, old Paget, who "attained to more than a hundred years, notwithstanding a large Beer glass of English Brandy, which he drank every morning for the last thirty years before his death."

The book has been well printed and produced by an Indian firm, and it is illustrated by reproductions of Reynolds's portrait of Lyttleton and four interesting old engravings.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Mrs. Piozzi and Isaac Watts ; being annotations in the autograph of Mrs. Piozzi on a copy of the first edition of the "Philosophical Essays" of Watts.
With an Introduction and Notes by JAMES P. R. LYELL.
London : Grafton and Co. 1934. Pp. 48. 5s. net.

MR. LYELL is to be congratulated on his find. The first edition of Watts's *Philosophical Essays* is not in the British Museum, the Bodleian, Cambridge University Library, nor in the National Library of Scotland. Not only has Mr. Lyell found such a rare book, but he has found a copy made unique by many annotations in the pleasing handwriting of Mrs. Piozzi. They were made about 1800, one being dated 1799 and others 1801. They are the kind that reveal the annotator rather than expand the text, and show all Mrs. Piozzi's liveliness and decision. At one point she will comment "Right ; Watts knows Logic to Perfection," at another, "Mercy on me. What a Fancy." She can be hasty in her judgments : after Watts has had a "long dissertation, purporting to be addressed by a Philosopher to some ladies on the subject of their dress, in which their dependence upon the animal and vegetable world for most of their attire is emphasized and illustrated," Mrs. Piozzi writes "Mrs. Barbauld has taken her Children's Books from this, & not done it half as well ; how should she, yet her Books are the modish study . . ." It is difficult to see how Mrs. Barbauld's *Hymns in Prose for Children* are "taken" from this passage. Watts's *Hymns for Children* are a much more likely source (Mrs. Barbauld refers to them in her preface) and they incidentally

contain the above sentiment in Song XXII—*Against Pride in Clothes*.

Her remarks occasionally introduce well-known names. "Mr. Hogarth told me that the Eye never grew larger from Birth to Death, and in effect we see children with *fine eyes* as we call them—a Thousand Times for once that we admire Men and Women's eyes; only (as he said) because they looked larger & finer among the Infants Features, than among the Features of Grown Persons." And to Watts's argument that "*constant or perpetual Cogitation* seems to belong to the very Nature, Essence and Substance of a Spirit, and that when it ceases to think it ceases to be. And herein it bears a very near resemblance to God, and is the fairest Image of its Maker, whose very Being admits of no Sleep nor Quiescence, but is all conscious Activity," she adds "I *think* this was likewise Doctor Johnson's Opinion.—I *think* so."

The book is unfortunately marred by carelessness. The facsimile on p. 38 shows how inaccurate is the transcript of Mrs. Piozzi's annotations and even of Watts's text: there are thirteen mistakes in the page and two words are omitted, one of them being Mrs. Piozzi's comment, "Charming!" References are not given in full, e.g. the footnotes on pp. 9 and 10. The reference to Milton on p. 44 should be to line 561 not to 558; and that to p. 24 on p. 21 should be to p. 26. Mr. Lyell annotates names like Hogarth and Mrs. Barbauld and neglects others such as Henry. The book is a slight one, and a generous proportion of it is taken up with an Introduction some of which will be considered unnecessary by the people who are likely to look at the book. Would not publication in a periodical have better suited its size and nature?

ARTHUR TILLOTSON.

Jonathan Swift : Gedanken und Schriften Über Religion und Kirche. Von HANS REIMERS. Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co., M.B.H. 1934. Pp. vi+194. RM. 8.50.

THOSE writings of Swift which bear directly on Christian belief and Church affairs form but a comparatively small part of the whole, and are not in themselves of singular importance. Hutton's *History of the English Church* in the days of Queen Anne contains

no mention of Swift. His genius lay elsewhere ; and his fame is not with churchmen. Nevertheless he was a vigorous defender of the profession he had adopted, a stout upholder of the Anglican Church, and an effective assailant of her critics. But there is little to differentiate Swift the ecclesiastic and Swift the politician. In either character he shows the same practical instinct, the same concentration upon facts and realities, the same contempt for the speculative and the obscure ; and his weapons are the same—irony and satire. He employed wit, banter, and invective on the side of religion, and with such effect on one occasion that his pretended abstract of Collins's argument for freethinking is said to have frightened that deistical writer into Holland.

The dogmas and tenets of orthodoxy Swift held to be of vital importance to the well-being of society ; but, eschewing the methods of the professional apologist, he argued gravely against the admitted advantages of abolishing Christianity. The serious-minded suspect wit, and from the first the author of *A Tale of a Tub* was charged with irreverence. But religion, in his own understanding of it, was a reality to Swift. He changed his political party, throwing in his lot with the Tories because their support of the establishment was not in doubt ; and in the Anglican Church he found the best expression of religion for Englishmen.

Swift's attitude toward the Church and religion, as evidenced in his writings, his familiar letters, and the judgment of those who knew him best, calls for little elaboration. We may, however, question the nature of his inmost beliefs and ask how far he found support in personal conviction. " I am not answerable to God for the doubts that arise in my own breast, since they are the consequence of that reason which he hath planted in me, if I take care to conceal those doubts from others, if I use my best endeavours to subdue them, and if they have no influence on the conduct of my life." Is this the confession of an inward scepticism ? It is rather to be read in a reverse sense. He was not constrained to admit hidden unbelief. But, in the end, we realise that, as with so much else in his life, Swift has kept his secret.

The author of this monograph, which appears as No. 9 in the *Britannica* series, suggests by his title that some interpretation will be given of the nature of Swift's personal and private beliefs. But, despite the substantial character of the work, expectation is disappointed. Even the last chapter on " Swifts eigene Stellung zur

Religion und Kirche" has nothing new to say; nor does it reach an intimate understanding.

Although Herr Reimers recognizes the need of reading Swift's personality and character in conjunction with any inquiry into his attitude toward religion and the Church, the relationship is but loosely pursued. The author's knowledge of English politics, civil and ecclesiastical, during the earlier part of the eighteenth century is, for the most part, sound. He has grasped the salient characteristics of the age and presents its problems well, if with some diffuseness and repetition. So far he is a reliable guide, following the accepted authorities, English and German. But, in justifying his title, the figure of Swift, as a religious thinker, is drawn to a disproportionate scale. Swift's attacks upon the deists and latitudinarians were sincere, and prompted by a real belief in the danger of their doctrines to Church and society, but he was the pamphleteer and not the thinker. He made no attempt to combat the thought of Hobbes, Locke, and Shaftesbury; and to discuss him in conjunction with their names tends to misconception.

Swift's tracts on church and religion fall broadly into two groups, a few early pamphlets, serious or satirical, and a much later handful relating to the Test Act, or written to defend the Irish parochial clergy against encroachments. They display wit, irony, powerful invective, good sense, and some constructive suggestion, but it can hardly be said that they entitle him to a place in the story of the development of religious thought. And it is here, despite his recognition of Swift's direct and practical instinct, that Herr Reimers is likely to create misunderstanding. In his abstract of *Mr. Collins's Discourse* Swift observed that "the bulk of mankind is as well qualified for flying as thinking." We fly to-day, but thinking (so-called) still makes "wild work in the world." And, as a controversialist, Swift looked to the objective results of his opponents' thinking, holding these up to scorn and ridicule, not the concepts underlying them.

Herr Reimers falls into some minor mistakes in detail. For example, the *Ode to Sancroft* (p. 30) should, in its still unfinished form, be dated 1692, not 1689. On p. 12 the Duchess of Marlborough is still "Lady," seven years after her husband had been created a Duke. And there are many mistakes, both author's and printer's, German and English, which have escaped correction. A loose errata leaf attributes over twenty errors noted to haste in

printing. But these are only a selection, and we are not told why such speed was imperative. There is no index; and the bibliographical list of authorities might well have been more carefully arranged.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Walter Savage Landor. Last Days, Letters and Conversations. Edited with explanatory comments by H. C. MINCHIN. London: Methuen. 1934. Pp. xiv+174. 6s. net.

THROUGH the generosity of Professor A. J. Armstrong of Baylor University, Waco, Texas, Mr. Minchin has been enabled to edit certain Landor MSS. which contain much interesting material. The volume which Mr. Minchin has published includes two new Imaginary Conversations, the one between Abelard and Heloise, and the other between the lovers and Heloise's uncle, Fulbert, each perfect in its tender and simple grace. But the volume is chiefly concerned with Landor's letters to Browning from 1859 to 1864. They paint a vivid picture of the aged poet, suffering from increasing physical weakness, but even more from the restraints of poverty and the humiliation of dependence on his hostile family. Only his own indomitable spirit and the kindly care of Browning sustained him through these troubles. Many glimpses are given both of the lovable and the repellent elements in Landor's nature. We observe also with what passionate eagerness he longed for the unification of Italy and how his sympathy went out to the patriot who would sacrifice everything for his country—to a Garibaldi, a Kossuth, an Arndt. The letters likewise contain many expressions of Landor's literary opinions, often dogmatic or biased, but seldom uninteresting. Thus of Macaulay he writes: "His history is partial, his criticism superficial, his style fantastic," and of Goethe: "He is more of a metaphysician than a poet. This will be found out when the Germans are sober."

Mr. Minchin's volume is welcome on its own account and also as a reminder of the need for a complete edition of Landor's letters.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

Modern Prose Style. By BONAMY DOBREE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. vi+262. 6s. net.

THIS book might be described as a very varied and representative anthology of modern English prose, enlivened by charmingly written comments which ask us to listen very carefully to the "voice" that is speaking to us and help us to infer from its rhythms and phrases something about the mind and character and interests of the speaker. Then, in a concluding chapter, after having given us so many examples of "The New Way of Writing," the author asks us to consider what are the most important differences between the characteristic modern "voice" and that of the last century and of earlier centuries. His own conclusion is given in the following paragraph:

All the previous ages whose writers have been quoted or referred to here had something they could take for granted, and it never occurred to the older writers that they could not take themselves for granted. We can be sure of nothing; our civilization is threatened, even the simplest things we live by: we are on the verge of amazing changes. In our present confusion our only hope is to be scrupulously honest with ourselves, so honest as to doubt our own minds and the conclusions they arrive at. Most of us have ceased to believe, except provisionally, in truths, and we feel that what is important is not so much truth as the way our minds move towards truths. Therefore, to quote M. Cocteau again, "Form must be the form of the mind. Not a way of saying things, but of thinking them." Perhaps that is why we nowadays instinctively mistrust any one who pontificates: and, as a matter of experience, if we examine the writings of the pontificators, people skilled in "a way of saying things," we invariably find that their style is bad, that falsity has crept in somewhere. The writer is not being faithful to the movement of his mind; he is taking things for granted, and he fills us of to-day with uneasiness (pp. 220-1).

This, if you insist on asking for it, seems to be Mr. Dobree's "point," although, being himself no "pontificator," he does not invite us to watch him rolling his point from chapter to chapter until it has attained the dimensions of a good-sized snowball. Like Shakespeare, "his precepts and axioms drop casually from him," and the following words from his preface seem to suggest that he is "more careful to please than to instruct":

This book is not intended for writers in general, nor for critics, though I naturally hope that some of them will find it entertaining if they read it. It is meant for anybody who takes lay interest in writing,

who might perhaps be helped to understand why he likes some authors better than others. . . . Authors and critics will either find what I have to say commonplace and obvious, or will be irritated into disagreement.

It is therefore rather beside the point to quarrel with his classification of prose as "Descriptive," "Explanatory," and "Emotive," or with the various sub-divisions under which he arranges his extracts, since it is clear that he himself attaches little importance to them, regarding them simply as matters of convenience. For my part, I have only two small criticisms to make, and I offer them without any sense of irritation. The book would perhaps have been both more useful and more entertaining if after each extract which Mr. Dobree considered to be good he had more often given another, as nearly as possible on the same subject, which he considered to be bad. And perhaps he indulges rather excessively in a modern variety of the old sport of "hunting the letter": for example, in a passage from Mr. Wyndham Lewis we are asked to "count how often at first the letter 't' occurs, or the combination 'ck'" (p. 103). I hasten to add that the book is packed with good things, and I offer as a sample this comment on two descriptions of nature, by Mr. Eric Parker and Mr. Paul Elmer More:

I submit that what happens when a writer eschews "mere description" in favour of philosophic or poetical contemplation, is that he fails to be either philosophic or poetic, and gives us a portrait of himself. The only salvation for any writer is to keep his eye on the object. If the object is a thrush, let him keep his eye on the thrush; if philosophy, let him keep his inward eye on philosophy: in either instance he may achieve art, which he certainly will not do if he keeps it on poetry.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Longinus and English Criticism. By T. R. HENN. Cambridge University Press. 1934. Pp. viii+163. 6s. net.

IN this essay, intended, as he says, solely for the use of students of English, Mr. Henn has given a careful exposition of all the topics treated by Longinus, has tried to liberate them from the false interpretations imposed on them by eighteenth-century critics, and to construct from them, or to find in them, a conception of poetry and a theory of poetic communication useful and acceptable to modern readers. His book is not merely static—an invitation to a careful and detached inspection of Longinus in and for himself; not merely

negative—an exposure and denunciation of his misinterpreters, but positive and practical, keeping steadily in view the question, “Can Longinus help us to understand and appreciate poetry?”

The train of reasoning which led to the petrification of the word *ὑψος* in “the Sublime” and “the Grand Style” is admirably suggested in the following paragraph:

Perhaps the whole trouble started with Longinus’ own quotation from Genesis. Can we reconstruct the argument? ‘He goes to the Bible for his most famous quotation: we can find hundreds of examples of the same kind—Job, Isaiah, the Psalms, Ecclesiastes. They embody the qualities of divinity, power, simplicity. Only Hebrew poetry is truly sublime. Milton is its chief exponent, with his theological framework. But Ossian, too, has produced this vagueness and terror; Gray, too, in *The Bard*. All these are full of the high seriousness of Aristotle. The grand style is the common ground.’ And so the point of the *Περί ὑψους* is missed, and its teaching fades into insignificance.

Mr. Henn asks us to consider carefully what Longinus says about the *effects* of *ὑψος*, and he finds his chief claim to modernity in the sentence, “For it is not to persuasion but to ecstasy that passages of extraordinary genius carry the bearer.” He connects this notion of ecstasy with Aristotle’s *Katharsis* and with psychological rather than “philosophical” theories of poetry, dragging *ὑψος* away from “the sublime” and nearer to “the subliminal.”

For the future of poetry seems to me to fall, not in the half-heartedly justified field of philosophy, but rather among those infinitely subtle and complicated individual emotions, which may be affected so vastly for good or evil by the *lie* made acceptable and enduring.

He insists, with great clarity and persuasiveness, that style as conceived by Longinus is something organic, not something superimposed, and he illustrates and gives life and fulness to the points at issue by means of numerous well-chosen extracts from English poetry and prose.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

An Attempt to approach the C-Text of Piers the Plowman.

By F. A. R. CARNEGIE. London: University of London Press.
1934. Pp. 83. 3s. 6d. net.

THIS is a London M.A. dissertation, published with the help of a grant from the Publication Fund of the Senate. It consists of a text of Passus III–V (which Mr. Carnegie shows good reason for

renumbering II-IV) of the C-text of *Piers Plowman*, on the basis of MS. Add. 35157, with collations from thirteen other MSS.

The author follows a dissertation by Miss B. F. Allen of University College, London, in her classification of the C-text MSS. Both investigators agree in preferring the *t*-group (MSS. TH₂) to the *p*-group, from one of which Skeat took his C-text, and in placing the *i*-group nearer to the *t*-group than is the *p*-group. Mr. Carnegy would have made his argument clearer by listing at the beginning the MSS. collated with their abbreviations; those comprising the *p*-group are not easy to identify.

The details are open to a good deal of criticism. On p. 11 there is a list of "examples of reduction of the alliteration by *p*, and *p*'s poor appreciation of rhythm." In the first example, II, 15, there is no difference in the readings. In the second, II, 57, *p* has "þat were of medes kunne" against "þat of med kyn wern," where the former is the smoother metre. In II, 107 (the fourth example given) *p* has "Yn luciferes lordshup" against "Yn lordshipe with lucifer"; both are equally metrical, but in the context the former is much better sense. The examples of contamination by A- and B-texts on pp. 20-23 are puzzling. In the first place, Mr. Carnegy constantly describes as "the reading of the A-text" that of only Vernon and a few allied MSS., though twice he is more specific. Secondly, nearly all the examples that he gives as showing B-contamination can also be as well derived from A-MSS., and in the first of these, II, 14, "Her robyng was ricchere," where he explains the reading of F, "ribaned ricchere," as derived from B's "ribanes of red golde," he ignores the more likely source in Vernon, "I-ribaunt (other MSS. "(&) ribande") with gold."

The book is printed as it was submitted to the University of London, but the text itself should certainly have been revised. The editor, though he does not state the fact, has consistently written *u* for initial *v* when representing a vowel, while following the MS. in allowing *u* to stand for the medial *v*-sound. Hyphens are used occasionally; more often words are joined without comment, as "madame," II, 2, for the MS. "ma dame." The group generally printed "*ere*" varies between "*er*" and "*ere*" (italics not being used for expansions), and the abbreviation generally expanded to *-us* becomes *-es*. In addition, the first 100 lines of the text contain the following errors: II, 3, "þar" for "þat" (a misprint); 11, "And" for "an"; 38, "helpeþ" for "helpeth"; 51, "this"

(relegated to the footnote) for " & his "; 52, " pou " for " pow "; 63, " syvile " for " syuile "; 68, " sulveres " for " sulueres "; 99, " jangele " for " iangele ".

MABEL DAY.

The Dream of the Rood. Edited by BRUCE DICKINS and ALAN S. C. ROSS. (Methuen's Old English Library.) London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1934. Pp. xii+50. 2s. net.

THIS is the fourth volume in Messrs. Methuen & Co.'s ambitious and promising series of editions of Anglo-Saxon texts. In plan and method it closely resembles its predecessors, which were reviewed in this journal in July of last year: so that what was there said in general criticism holds good also of the new edition. But since *The Vision of the Cross* has very great poetical merit intrinsically—quite apart from its many other interesting aspects—and is, indeed, among the best religious poems in our language, this learned and valuable edition suffers in special degree from that over-compression which has so far seemed an inevitable characteristic of the series. For within fifty pages the Editors have given us not only *The Vision of the Cross*, with full *apparatus criticus*, but have also included the Runic inscription on the Ruthwell Cross with a linguistic discussion, and even that on the Brussels Cross in Anglo-Saxon characters with suggestions as to its provenance, though this latter's connection with their main theme is but of the slightest. Everywhere there is evidence of deep learning and painstaking research, and on several points new light is thrown. Messrs. Dickins and Ross have probably given us the most thorough and complete treatment of their subject that is possible within the limits of such a slender volume; and it must be said at once that this is an important addition to our knowledge of its subject. But neither the student of Anglo-Saxon literature, the philologist, nor the runologist will be satisfied with the manner in which his interests have been provided for; and the undergraduate (for whom, apparently, the work is primarily intended) will be bewildered by this compressed mass of ill-arranged detail.

In an agreeably written introduction, the Editors discuss the relation between the fragments carved in runes on the Ruthwell Cross and the poem of the Vercelli MS., for which they have retained the (in England) traditional title *The Dream of the Rood*.

They also touch all too briefly upon the possible source of the original poem, the date and character of the Ruthwell and Brussels inscriptions, the metre of the Vercelli MS. poem, etc. The text of the runic inscription (transliterated) is printed below that of the *Dream*—a very convenient plan—and there are the usual explanatory notes, select bibliography, and glossary.

The text is carefully printed from Max Förster's well-known reduced facsimile of the Vercelli Codex, and the transcription of the runic inscription has had the benefit of Professor Dickens' own first-hand examination of the Cross itself. But the handling of difficult passages is generally disappointing. For space has not been found for the serious discussion of some new editorial conjectures admitted into the text, and these seem in consequence sometimes over-confident. Thus, for instance, at l. 9 the ingenious emendation *engeldryhte* is proposed and admitted into the text for the MS. *engel dryhtnes ealle*; and we are merely told that "The suggested emendation, drastic as it is, gives good sense ('hosts' or perhaps 'orders' of angels) and seems preferable to Cook's suggestion *englas dryhtnes ealle*, which does not improve the metre." Nothing is said of the palæographical aspect of the question, nor is the rejected emendation merely Cook's, but has the weighty and earlier backing of Kluge and Sievers.¹ In l. 10 the difficult phrase *purh forðesceaft* is very arbitrarily explained as meaning "beautiful in virtue of an ancient decree," with almost no discussion. In l. 54 the MS. *forð eode* is printed as one word *forðeode* without a note of any sort. The possibility of taking *banan* of l. 66 and *guman* of l. 146, as Late West-Saxon gen. pls. is not even mentioned, though *Beow.*, l. 525 is an example likely to be known even to undergraduate readers. The syntactical point of the use of *æghwylc anra* in both ll. 86 and 108 is not touched on, though no undergraduate will understand it without help. There should have been fuller discussions of the problems presented by *bealuwara* of l. 79, *holtwudu* (emended from MS. *holmwudu*) of l. 91, and *unforht* (ably defended against the usual emendation) of l. 117; and it may be doubted if a convincing case has been made out for any of these.

The bibliography is, like those of previous editions in the series, not selected on any easily discernible principle, and no indication is

¹ *Das altenglische "Traumgesicht vom Kreuz,"* von Hans Bütow; Heidelberg, 1935, p. 57.

given to the student of the value of the individual items, some of which seem quite pointless; moreover, there is some inaccuracy in presenting this list. The interesting story of the first printing of the poems of the Vercelli Codex is not told: yet the first item of the select bibliography under the heading "editions" is merely given as "1836 B. Thorpe, *Appendix to Mr. Cooper's Report on Rymer's Foedera*." This will scarcely help the student to find the book noted, and, when found, the only value it can have (apart from that of sentiment) is the explanation it affords of the usual English title of the poem—a matter not even mentioned. Or again, of what use is the item "[1925] A. Ricci, *Il Sogno della Croce; Cristo*"?

The glossary is of the same general character as its predecessors in the series, and is of little real use therefore to anyone—though carefully carried out in the main. The *Oxford English Dictionary* is once more put to dubious use by printing the word "under which the O.E. word is discussed" after most items in the glossary. Yet the O.E.D. is not a dictionary of any particular period, nor yet a *thesaurus*, nor does it usually "discuss" Anglo-Saxon words: and this way of presenting it must definitely be considered a misuse, a setting of the *Dictionary* unfairly in a wrong light. *Forðgan* is, as might be expected from the silent emendation of the MS. of l. 54 already mentioned, glossed as a single word, and a reference given to FORTHGO in the O.E.D. (which turns out to be of no help whatever); and the meaning of *forðgesceaft* is simply given as "ancient decree" with a reference to the notes.

There are a few odd misprints, including the misspelling (on the outer cover) of Professor Dickins' name. The title of A. Ricci's book is again misprinted in the list of abbreviations (p. xi), the problematical rune in *almehttig* of the Ruthwell Cross is transliterated, according to Professor Dickins' system by an Anglo-Saxon *g*-symbol in the text, but appears as a Middle English *ȝ* in the Introduction (p. 5); and the use of the Anglo-Saxon *g* in Latin inscriptions in which all the other letters are Roman looks odd (p. 4, etc.) without explanation.

Space does not permit of an examination of many suggestions of interest and real value put forward in this most learnedly packed edition; and one cannot read it through without feeling strongly the hope that the editors will take an early opportunity of bringing out a full and well-presented edition worthy of the great poem they

have here handled with such real knowledge and yet so jejune. And, in particular, among those matters which should receive fuller treatment, may be mentioned the question of the title of the poem ('Thorpe's *The Holy Rood, a Dream* seems to have originally suggested the one still used by the editors), the literary qualities of the poem and the matter of its possible relation with Cynewulf or with his school. On the linguistic side, the nature of the so-called Anglian forms in the poetical MSS. of Anglo-Saxon needs a much more thorough examination.

C. L. WRENN.

Die Einheitlichkeit des Ormmulum : Studien zur Textkritik, zu den Quellen und zur sprachlichen Form von Orrmins Evangelienbuch. Von HEINRICH CHRISTOPH MATTHES. Heidelberg : Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung. 1933. Pp. xvi+277. Mk. 17.50.

FOR all who are interested in the *Orrmulum*—whether their chief concern be linguistic, literary, or historical—Dr. Matthes' careful study is a book of outstanding importance. It is too often assumed that Orrm's work is merely valuable for the use that can be made of its famous orthographic peculiarities by the philologist, largely because most that has been written by competent scholars about it has dealt exclusively with this aspect. But, as a carefully planned and personally supervised compilation of metrical homilies on the life of Christ belonging to a period at least as early as the end of the twelfth century and showing links with Ælfric and later O.E. religious literature, the *Orrmulum* clearly is of some importance to mediævalists quite other than philologists. Nearly sixty years have passed since the only complete edition was revised : and so pre-occupied have scholars been with mainly linguistic aspects of the book throughout this whole period that no thorough re-examination of the MS. as a whole had been made till Dr. Matthes undertook the present volume. For the work of Dr. Sigurd Holm in 1922—though valuable—was, as he himself indicated, too handicapped by the necessity of hasty collation to afford much definite result ; and Mr. K. Sisam's notes (to mention the other outstanding contribution to our knowledge of the *Orrmulum* recently made)¹ are primarily

¹ MSS. Bodley 340 and 342 in *Review of English Studies*, ix., No. 33.

concerned with orthography. Dr. Matthes, who writes with caution, says that he too did not spend long enough in the Bodleian to reach finality on a number of points. He has, nevertheless, clearly made a thorough study of the MS. itself, and has also made full use of the expert palæographical help which he acknowledges having plentifully received from Dr. Craster and other specialists in the study of MSS. His work, therefore, which puts forward a number of distinctly revolutionary views, must be taken seriously into account by all future workers in this field, and will also be found to provide part of a sure foundation for that new edition of the text which all are agreed is a desideratum.

Dr. Matthes was set upon the path which he has here so profitably pursued by the chance discovery that the so-called *Preface* to the *Ormmulum* was not, as hitherto supposed, an independent part of the Introduction, but a MS. insertion made in the *Dedication* at a selected point between ll. 156 and 157; and this and the inferences which it suggested led him to a complete first-hand examination of MS. *Junius* 1 and its possible sources.

Dr. Matthes begins by pointing out that we must assume from the words in the *Dedication* (ll. 28 *et seq.* and 335 *et seq.*) that homilies on all of the 230 Latin Gospel-texts had already been completed by the author at the time of writing the *Dedication*: so that the extant matter on only thirty-two texts must represent but an incomplete first volume of the whole compilation, which probably occupied four or five originally. He then shows that the list of Latin texts comprising the last twelve from the Acts of the Apostles (and separately headed *De Actibus Apostolorum* in the MS.) did not form part of Ormm's own approved MS. and never had any homilies written for them. There follows an examination of the so-called corrections and additions in various hands, which leads the writer to the conclusion that practically all except the added texts from the Acts of the Apostles must be regarded as types which may well be merely the *same hand* throughout, changing in *type* with changes in pen, ink, time of writing, etc.; and that at least they are almost always so closely knit and consistent in purpose and tendency with what may be inferred as Ormm's own changes of point of view found in the main body of the MS. that they can best be explained as being substantially the corrections and insertions and omissions of the author himself or made with his direct personal guidance and supervision. It is this fundamental unity discernible throughout

the bulk of the MS. changes which gives point to Dr. Matthes' chosen title. Anyone who looks at the MS. will agree in the main that this new conclusion is to be accepted, and that the substitution of the notion of types of handwriting which may occur *in one and the same scribe* for the hitherto accepted conception of different hands is important: since it enables one to conceive of the general unity of the whole much more readily and is supported by a knowledge of palæography not available when the printed edition and its revision were undertaken.

Next, Dr. Matthes shows conclusively that the statement in the *Dedication* (ll. 29 *et seq.*) which had led to the universal assumption that the *Orrmulum* is a series of homilies on the Gospels to be read throughout the Church's year, does not correspond with the facts: for the Latin texts are those which deal chronologically with the life of Christ and are not a series related to any known lectionary—they are indeed the texts for a series of homilies simply on the life of Christ.

Dr. Matthes' discussion of the sources of the *Orrmulum* is particularly satisfying: for he has found the explanation of the apparently contradictory uses of such expressions as Orrm's *pe boc* for both the Bible itself and for authorities on it. Orrm used, he has discovered, not Bede or Gregory or Ælfric, etc., as had been generally supposed, but a Bible glossed in the fullest sense—in fact a Bible MS. which contained both the famous *Glossa Ordinaria* attributed to Walafrid Strabo and the *Glossa Interlinearis* of Anselm of Laon. This is demonstrated by a series of parallel passages from the *Orrmulum* and the printed text (to whose significance he is the first to draw marked attention) entitled as follows: *Biblia cum Glossa Ordinaria Walafridi Strabonis aliorumque et Interlineari Anselmi Laudunensis*, printed at Strassburg in 1481. Naturally it is not yet possible to identify the actual MS. of the *Glossa Ordinaria cum Interlineari* which Orrm must have used (though MS. Darmstadt 543 seems in several ways to resemble this); but the explanation that Orrm used the great mediæval storehouse of Biblical interpretation, the *Glossa Ordinaria*, as his main source throughout, and that he meant by such expressions as *pe boc*, *haliz boc*, *boc*, etc., the Bible *with the Glosses*, is natural and convincing. It is just what one would expect in the circumstances. This is why Orrm never mentions the name of an actual author, and yet constantly uses material which we know to have come ultimately from

Gregory or Augustin or Bede. Like most mediæval writers, his authorities are many, but he has no *direct* link with any of them; and what more rational for a simple preacher of the end of the twelfth century than to rely whole-heartedly on the great *Glossa Ordinaria*?

Dr. Matthes has some very valuable information for the linguistic student of the *Orrmulum* in his chapter on the changes made in language in the marginal and interlinear corrections of the B-type, which he regards as mainly in the direction of simplification, normalization, or the carrying out of changes in method already discernible in the basic MS. After touching on Dr. Holm's view that "Broþerr Wallterr" was the "corrector," he shows—conformably to his principal thesis of the Unity of the *Orrmulum*, that these linguistic changes must be considered as those of the author himself. Thus, for instance, the oft-discussed substitution of *-le33c* for *-nesse* as the termination of abstract nouns is a metrical improvement; the change of *gode cweme* into *godd full cweme* is due to the tendency to weaken the final *e* of *gode* in pronunciation being regarded as a metrical danger; and the strange and single use of the fem. pronoun *ho* in *naffde ho* (due in the original MS. to the need for a pronominal form which could be elided) is corrected for the sake of linguistic consistency into Orrm's normal *3ho* with a further change in the wording of the line so as to overcome the metrical difficulty caused by the absence of elision thereby effected.

The volume concludes with a clear summary of the conclusions come to and convenient indexes of books and names; and throughout the book care has been taken to indicate clearly at the end of each chapter the results obtained so far. Into many further points of interest—such as Dr. Matthes' examination of the less significant types of corrections in the MS.—it is not possible to enter here; nor is it possible to attempt any detailed criticism of his arguments in a limited space. Perhaps an even fuller treatment of the palæographical evidence would have been an advantage, and there are omissions which will disappoint the philologist in the handling of the language—indeed, far too little attention has been paid to this aspect of the *Orrmulum* by Dr. Matthes. Perhaps he has felt a natural reaction from the too exclusively linguistic approach of most of his predecessors; and it is refreshing to find a book on the *Orrmulum* which is not mainly philological. Nevertheless, what is

still needed is a closer *rapprochement* between the linguistic and the palaeographical evidence; and Dr. Matthes would have obtained perhaps more definiteness in his results if he had attempted this more systematically. There are a small number of the inevitable misprints which must find their way into a volume of this sort—such as *-le33e* for *-le33c* in the list of contents on p. xv; but the book is generally printed accurately.

C. L. WRENN.

SHORT NOTICES

Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptis. Von MARGARETE WILLINSKY. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXII.) Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1932. Pp. xii + 228. M.10.

Literarische Einflüsse in schottischen Volksballaden: Versuch einer Kritischen Variantenvergleichung. Von Gabriele Humbert. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXIV.) Halle (Saale); Max Niemeyer Verlag. 1932. Pp. viii + 117. M.4.50.

These two studies consider in different ways the changes to which a ballad may be liable. Dr. M. Willinsky's was perhaps the easier task, since we have the Percy Folio MS. and we have the *Reliques*, but she has carried out her comparisons and assessments in a workmanlike and unmechanical way. Dr. G. Humbert deals with the more difficult, if not insoluble, problem of the interaction of oral tradition and printed versions. As she points out, we cannot, with any certainty of fidelity to an "original" version, carry an oral tradition back over more than three links, but the general style of the ballad will show whether the links were, e.g., educated or illiterate, and some knowledge of the chain, its dependence upon or independence of printed versions, may help us to some conclusions. Mr. Alexander Keith's *Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads* provides inestimable evidence of this kind; and Dr. Humbert, besides considering the history of all the ballads in the collection, has methodically compared some of them with other variants. It is noteworthy that while certain ballads are undoubtedly derived from broadsides and chapbooks, there is a much smaller number which can be directly traced to collections such as *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, and both classes have undergone refashioning in oral tradition. How has this "secondary oral circulation" affected versions which have undergone literary refashionings? How far can we distinguish its effects from those of the similar process exercised upon broadsides and later chapbooks? How far are apparently independent oral versions evidence of the essential genuineness of the "edited" versions which happen to have been printed earlier? The last question leads to a vindication of Peter Buchan's character, though not of his task and judgment: the others, though posed, can hardly receive a final answer, but the evidence which may tempt us to risk an answer is here clearly marshalled and set out.

EDITH C. BATHO.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

- Hamlets Bühnenlaufbahn (1601-1877).** W. WIDMANN. Leipzig : B. Tauchnitz. 1931. Pp. xii+276. Mk. 16.50.
- The Sailor in English Fiction and Drama (1550-1800).** H. F. WATSON. New York : Columbia University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1931. Pp. x+241. 17s. 6d. net.
- Tragic Relief.** P. K. GUHA. London : H. Milford. 1932. Pp. viii+233. 10s. 6d. net.
- Das Amerikanische Kurzschauspiel Zwischen 1910 und 1930.** G. L. PLESSOW. Halle : Max Niemeyer. 1933. Pp. viii+269. Mk. 10.
- Der Bedeutungswandel von M. E. Clerk und damit Zusammenhängende Probleme.** K. KREBS. Bonn : Peter Hausteine. 1933. Pp. ii+162. Mk. 6.30.
- Discovering Poetry.** ELIZABETH DREW. London : H. Milford. 1933. Pp. 224. 8s. 6d. net.
- An English Pronouncing Dictionary and Spelling-List in Anglic.** R. E. ZACHRISSON. Uppsala : Anglic Fund A.-B. ; Cambridge : W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd. 1933. Pp. xxiv+90.
- An Introduction to English Syntax.** E. KRUISINGA and J. KOOISTRA. Groningen : J. B. Walters. 1933. Pp. viii+131. Dutch guilders 1.90 ; 2.25 (paper and cloth).
- The Mind of Poe and other Studies.** K. CAMPBELL. Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1933. Pp. viii+237. \$2.50 ; 13s. net.
- The Old English Newspaper.** Mrs. H. RICHARDSON. (English Association pamphlet No. 86). London : H. Milford. 1933. Pp. 22. 2s. net.
- Production and Stage-Management at the Blackfriars Theatre.** J. ISAACS. (Shakespeare Association Pamphlet.) London : H. Milford. 1933. Pp. 28. 2s. net.
- The Pursuit of Death.** B. KURTZ. New York and London : Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. xxii+339. \$3.50 ; 13s. 6d. net.

- Rabelais in English Literature.** H. BROWN. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1933. Pp. xvi+254. 10s. 6d. net.
- The Survival of Geis in Mediæval Romance.** J. R. REINHARD. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1933. Pp. xii+441. M.20.
- Untersuchungen zur Bienfabel Mandevilles und zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte in Hinblick auf die Bienenfabelthese.** W. DECKELMANN. Hamburg: Friederischen, de Gruyter & Co. 1933. Pp. iv+136. Mk. 6.
- Zur Zusammenarbeit englischer Berufsdramatiker unmittelbar vor, neben und nach Shakespeare.** A. TIEGS. Breslau: Trewendt & Granler. 1933. Pp. viii+144. Mk. 2.50.
- Architektur in den Romanen Thomas Hardy's.** J. HARTMANN. (Privately printed.) 1934. Pp. viii+77.
- Irving Babbitt.** P. E. MORE. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 2.) 1934. Pp. 129-145.
- Beowulf and the Rāmāyana.** I. S. PETER. London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd. Pp. viii+139. 9s. net.
- George Berkeley und die Englische Literatur.** H. J. OERTEL. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1934. Pp. viii+146. Mk. 6.
- The Claim of our Mother Tongue.** Rev. the Hon. E. LYTTTELTON. (English Association pamphlet No. 87.) London: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. 12. 2s. net.
- A Critique of Modern English Prosody.** P. BARKAS. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1934. Pp. viii+101. Mk. 4.
- Five Elizabethan Comedies.** Ed. A. K. McILWRAITH. (The World's Classics Series, ccccxlii.) London: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. xx+308. 2s. net.
- Emerson and Evolution.** J. W. BEACH. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 4.) 1934. Pp. 474-497.
- The Best English.** H. C. WYLD. (S.P.E. Tract No. xxxix.) Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1934. Pp. 601-621. 2s. 6d. net.
- English Place-Names in the Light of the Terminal Theory.** R. E. ZACHRISSON. (Reprinted from *Studia Neophilologica* VI.) Uppsala: A.—B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln. 1934. Pp. 25-89. Sw. Kronor 4.

Die Englische Literatur der Heutigen Stunde als Ausdruck der Zeitwende und der Englischen Kulturgemeinschaft. B. FEHR. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1934. Pp. 96. Mk. 2.50.

English Poetry in the Nineteenth Century. B. I. EVANS. London: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. 15. 1s. net.

Vom Fabliau zu Boccaccio und Chaucer. M. LANGE. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co. 1934. Pp. vi+155. Mk. 7.

E. M. Forster and the Contemplative Novel. E. K. BROWN. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly* Vol. III, No. 3.) 1934. Pp. 349-361.

Studien zur Rezeption des Französischen Wortschatzes im Mittelenglischen. R. FEIST. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1934. Pp. xiv+87. Mk. 5.

Frankreich als Vermittler Englisch-Deutscher Einflüsse im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. M. BLASSNECK. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1934. Pp. viii+180.

Die Texte der Handel-Oratorien. ELIZABETH BREDENFÖRDER. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1934. Pp. 71.

Selections from Keats. Ed. J. EARNSHAW. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1934. Pp. viii+216. 3s. 6d. net.

D. H. Lawrence and Katherine Mansfield as Letter-Writers. L. CAZAMIAN. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 3.) 1934. Pp. 286-307.

The Poetic Genius of D. H. Lawrence. H. DAVIS. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 4.) 1934. Pp. 439-453.

Lang, Lockhart and Biography. H. J. C. GRIERSON. (Andrew Lang Lecture, 1933.) Oxford: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. 38. 2s. net.

Die 'Memoirs' um 1700. JOHANNA BIRNBAUM. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1934. Pp. viii+117. Mk. 4.50.

Miltons Anschauungen von Staat, Kirche, Toleranz. GERTRUD HARDELAND. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1934. Pp. xvi+175. Mk. 7.

Further Studies Concerning the Origin of Paradise Lost. H. MUTSCHMANN. (Privately printed.) 1934. Pp. 55. 4s. 6d.

- Thomas Percy.** H. MARWELL. (Privately printed.) 1934. Pp. 127.
- Five Pre-Shakespearean Comedies.** Ed. F. S. BOAS. (World's Classics Series, ccccxviii.) London: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. xviii+343. 2s. net.
- Shakespeare and Tolstoy.** G. W. KNIGHT. (English Association pamphlet No. 88.) London: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. 27. 2s. 6d. net.
- Thomas Warton and the Early Poems of Milton.** L. C. MARTIN. (Warton Lecture.) London: H. Milford. 1934. Pp. 21. 1s. 6d. net.
- Shakespeare's Sonnets.** Arranged by G. W. PHILLIPS. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1934. Pp. viii+163. 3s. 6d. net.
- Il Sorgere del Petrarchismo in Inghilterra e la Poesia di Sir Thomas Wyatt.** E. CHINI. Firenze. 1934. Pp. 23.
- Ursprung und Entwicklung des Monologs bis zu seiner Entfaltung bei Shakespeare.** ELISABETH VOLLMANN. Bonn: Peter Hanstein. 1934. Pp. 168. Mk. 6.90.
- Bulwers Verhältnis zur Geschichte.** H. Seifert. (Privately printed.) 1935. Pp. xii+119.
- The Dutch Influence on the English Vocabulary.** G. N. Clark. (S.P.E. Tract No. xlv.) Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1935. Pp. ii.+161-172. 1s. 6d. net.
- La Jalousie de Leontes.** G. Bonnard. (Bulletin de la Société des Études de Lettres, Lausanne, No. 26. Lausanne: Imprimerie Centrale S.A. 1935. Pp. 14.
- Parody.** Mrs. Herbert Richardson. (English Association Pamphlet No. 92.) London: H. Milford. 1935. Pp. 27. 2s. 6d. net.
- Untersuchungen über die Germanischen Schwachen Verben III. Klasse.** H. M. Flasdieck. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1935. Pp. iv+192. Mk. 9.
- Virginia Woolf.** Ruth Gruber. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1935. Pp. vi.+100.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

- ANGLIA, Band LIX. (Neue Folge XLVII.), Heft 3, 4, July 1935 (Johannes Hoops zum siebzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet)—
- Zur Palatalisierung (Karl Luick), pp. 273-86.
- Zur i-Epenthese im Altenglischen (Max Förster), pp. 287-98.
- Wanderer*, v. 25 und v. 6-7 (Walther Fischer), pp. 299-302.
- Quellenauswertung und Quellenberufung im *Orrmulum* (H. C. Matthes), pp. 303-18.
- Ein me. Gedicht über die fünf Freuden Marias (F. Holthausen), pp. 319-21.
- Critical text.
- Ein typisches Bussgedicht aus dem 15. Jahrh. (Karl Brunner), pp. 322-27.
- Text from Huntington MS. HM 501, with variants from Cambridge University Library MS. Gg 4. 31.
- Earl Rivers' Einleitung zu seiner Übertragung der *Weisheitssprüche der Philosophen* (Rudolf Hittmair), pp. 328-44.
- Von der Auffassung des Todes bei neuenglischen Dichtern (Alois Brandl), pp. 345-50.
- Das goldene Zeitalter in der englischen Renaissance (Paul Meissner), pp. 351-67.
- Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von *road* bei Shakespeare (Max Deutschbein), pp. 368-75.
- Die Entstehung des *Sommernachtstraums* (Wolfgang Keller), pp. 376-84.
- Shakespeareana (Arnold Schröer), pp. 385-90.
- Hamlet*, I. ii. 65; *Othello*, I. ii. 23; *Lear*, I. iv. 307.
- Metrisch-Grammatisches zu Shakespeare's *King Lear* (Wilhelm Franz), pp. 391-93.
- Robert Davenports Lustspiel *A new trick to cheat the devil* (Eduard Eckhardt), pp. 394-403.
- Zum Wesen des Puritanismus (Theodor Spira), pp. 404-13.
- Zum Problem des Barocks in der englischen Dichtung (Friedrich Wild), pp. 414-22.

- Die Anspielung auf Avians Fabel *De cupido et invido* in Withers
Abuses stript and whipt (Bruno Borowski), pp. 423-34.
 Loda in Macphersons *Ossian* (Otto L. Jiriczek), pp. 435-40.
 Tennysons *Ulysses* (Friedrich Brie), pp. 441-47.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. VIII., 1st Quarter 1935—

- A Further Patron of *The City-Madam* (A. K. McIlwraith), pp. 17-18.
 Copy dedicated to "Richard Steadwel Esquire."

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, Vol. 152, August 1935—

- Thackeray and the Melancholy Humorist (C. B. Thackeray), pp. 160-75.
 Thackeray and Canon W. H. Brookfield; a protest against misrepresentations.

— October —

- Fanny Keats and her Letters (Marie Adami), pp. 385-409.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Band 70, Heft 2, August 1935—

- Zwei Gedichte aus der Handschrift Trinity College, Cambridge, 323
 (B. 14. 39) (Herausgegeben von Karl Brunner), pp. 221-43.
 Dryden and the Religious Elements in the Classical Tradition (G. M.
 Turnell), pp. 244-61.
Ae. defu (W. Krogmann), pp. 321-22.
Ae. georman-, geormen- (W. Krogmann), pp. 322-23.
 Richtigstellung (W. Krogmann), pp. 323-24.
Ae. éolet.
 Zur neuenglischen Etymologie (F. Holthausen), pp. 324-30.
 Corrections of his *Etymologische Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache*.
 Zu Percy's Ausgabe der Gedichte des Earls von Surrey (Hans Hecht),
 pp. 330-31.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XVII., August 1935—

- New Methods for the Study of Literature (A. G. van Kranendonk),
 pp. 129-40.
 Calling for a repressor of overmuch blaming of the historian.
 Herlekin and Herlewin (Kemp Malone), pp. 141-44.
 Origin and early meaning.
Cymbeline, II. ii., and *The Eve of St. Agnes* (T. B. Stroup), pp. 144-45.
 "The message . . . to be done . . ." (Claude Jones), p. 146.
 Note on *Sleep and Poetry*, l. 323; use of phrase by Chaucer, Spenser, and
 Shakespeare.

— October —

- Amphi-Atlantic English (Allen W. Read), pp. 161-78.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 119

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 168
(New Series 68), Heft 1, 2, October 1935—

Sacerdotal Science in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, I. (W. C. Curry),
pp. 25-36.

The Songs in John Phillip's *Patient Grissell* (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 77-
79.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV., July
1935—

Macbeth's Changing Character (W. C. Curry), pp. 311-38.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (concluded) (Elizabeth M. Wright)
pp. 339-50.

Obsolete English Words : Some Recent Views (E. B. Dike), pp. 351-
65.

Spenser and Nature (E. C. Knowlton), pp. 366-76.

Spenser's conception of Nature as an allegorical figure.

Tieck and the Elizabethan Drama : His Marginalia (Harvey W.
Hewett-Thayer), pp. 377-407.

Form or Function as the Basis of Grammar ? (W. F. Leopold)
pp. 414-31.

— October —

Peter Bales, Timothy Bright, and William Shakespeare (W. Matthews),
pp. 483-510.

Relative merits of Brachygraphy and Characterie.

Meat Foods of the Anglo-Saxons (F. W. Grube), pp. 511-29.

The Connection of the Katherine Group with Old English Prose
(Dorothy Bethurum), pp. 553-64.

Influence of Ælfric.

The Designation of an Atmospheric Phenomenon (George Watson),
pp. 565-66.

Names for the flickering motion of the air just above the earth on a hot day.

LANGUAGE, Vol. XI., September 1935—

Old English *bebeodan* and *forbeodan* (Luise Haessler), pp. 211-15.
Semantic development.

LEUVENSCHÉ BIJDRAGEN, Vol. XXVII., Parts 1 and 2, 1935—

Die Diphthonge im Englischen (Südenglischen), pp. 26-30.

LIBRARY, Vol. XVI., September 1935—

Type Faces, Old and New (Beatrice Warde), pp. 121-43.

Books and Manuscripts formerly in the Possession of John Bale
(Honor McCusker), pp. 144-65.

First Editions of Shakespeare's Quartos (Henrietta C. Bartlett), pp. 166-72.

Census of extant copies.

The Sources of Quarles's *Emblems* (Gordon S. Haight), pp. 188-209.
Hugo's *Pia Desideria*, and *Typus Mundi*.

The Early Nineteenth-Century Drama (continued) (R. Crompton Rhodes), pp. 210-31.

Charles Jennens as Editor of Shakespeare (Gordon Crosse), pp. 236-40.

The Undated Quarto of *I Honest Whore* (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 241-42.

Copy at the Folger Library.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. IV., June 1935—

Two Notes on *Piers Plowman*: the Abbot of Abingdon and the date of the C text; Chaucer's debt to Langland (Nevill Coghill), pp. 83-94.

Evidence in support of 1393-4; Chaucer's *Plowman*, and other parallels.

The Date of the Early English Translation of the *Candet nudatum pectus* (S. Harrison Thomson), pp. 100-05.

Evidence of Durham MS., favouring date before 1258.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. L., November 1935—

New Songs of the Reign of Henry VIII (B. M. Wagner), pp. 452-55.
From MS. Ashmole 176.

Saint-Amant as "Preromantic" (Robert A. Aubin), pp. 456-57.

Anonymous translation (in 1716) of *La Solitude*.

Some Additions to the Poems of Lord Dorset (R. G. Howarth), pp. 457-59.

From manuscripts in the British Museum.

A Restoration "Improvement" of Thomas Dekker (Benjamin Boyce), pp. 460-61.

Poor Robin's Visions, a version of *News from Hell*.

Hakewill and the Arthurian Legend (G. Williamson), pp. 462-63.

An Attribution to Suckling (G. Williamson), pp. 463-64.

A Sermon on Malt: variant version.

Editions of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith (Irving L. Churchill), pp. 464-65.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXX., October 1935—

"The Murder of Gonzago" (G. Bullough), pp. 433-44.

The death of Francesco Maria I della Rovere, Duke of Urbino, a probable source for *Hamlet*.

The Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660-1700 (Sybil Rosenfeld), pp. 445-59.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 121

Proverbs in the *Ancren Riwe* and the *Recluse* (B. J. Whiting), pp. 502-05.

Milton and the "Postscript" (G. W. Whiting), pp. 506-08.
Evidence against Milton's authorship.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. XX., Part 4, July 1935—

The "Definite Forms," II. (R. Volbeda), pp. 287-99.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 169, July 6, 1935—

English "Curds" or "Fresh Cheese" and the Wood-Louse (H. E. Allen), pp. 9-10.
Dialect names.

— July 13—

Marlowe in Kentish Tradition (Mark Eccles), pp. 20-23.

Authenticity of the manuscript inscriptions in the *Hero and Leander* quarto, and other notes. Continued, July 20, pp. 39-41; July 27, pp. 58-61; further note, August 24, pp. 134-35.

Herschel and the Poets (David W. Davies), p. 28.

Note on *Prometheus Unbound*, iv. 225.

— July 20—

Ben Jonson Queries (B. H. N.), p. 47.

"Denis of thy Father's School"; the Half-Moon and the Sun in Aldersgate-street. Replies by E. Bensley, E. A. White, and K. Rogers, August 3, pp. 86-88; by K. Rogers, August 17, pp. 123-24; by T. O. M., September 7, p. 177.

— August 10—

A Licence by Sir George Buc (B. M. Wagner), pp. 97-8.

In 1619, to shewe "certayne rare motions" in the provinces.

— August 17—

Alchemical Terms: Early Examples (Ralph E. Ockenden), pp. 115-16.

From Hester's translation of Duchesne's *Sclopetarius*, 1590.

Chaucer Allusions (Dorothy F. Atkinson), p. 116.

Six eighteenth-century allusions; further allusions cited, September 21, p. 205; October 5, p. 241.

— August 24—

Poems and Memoranda attributable to Dr. Eleazar Duncon (E. S. de Beer), pp. 128-29.

A Probable Source for *Gulliver's Travels* (F. S. Rockwell), pp. 131-33.

Ned Ward's *The Humours of a Coffee-House*, 1699.

Samuel Richardson's House at Fulham (W. M. Sale, Jr.), pp. 133-34.

NOTES AND QUERIES, September 7—

The Free Briton; or, *The Opinion of the People*, and F. Walsingham's
Free Briton (C. Lennart Carlson), pp. 166-68.

— September 14—

Quentin Durward: the Astrologer's Expedient (V. R.), p. 188.
Origin and variant versions of story.

— September 21—

Contemporary Evidence for Royal Favour to Milton (T. O. M.),
p. 221.
Peter Heimbach's letter of June 6, 1666.

— September 28—

Canting terms in Elizabethan Drama (H. W. Crundell), p. 222.
"Parlous"; "Tame cheater"; "Skains-mate."

— October 5—

William Hazlitt and Benjamin Robert Haydon (Clarke Olney), pp. 237-
39.
Continued October 12, pp. 256-58.
An Early American Printing of Shelley (T. O. Mabbott), p. 242.
Stanzas written in Dejection, near Naples, in the *Newport Mercury* of
14 August 1824.

— October 12—

Robert Baron, Cavalier Poet (Kenneth C. Slagle), pp. 254-56.
Newspaper Circulation a Hundred Years Ago (E. Heron-Allen),
p. 261.
Advertisement of c. 1839.

— October 26—

Shakespeare and Agincourt (H. W. Crundell), p. 295.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XIV., July 1935—

The Riddle of the *Ormulum* (H. B. Hinckley), pp. 193-216.
Linguistic and palæographical evidence for a Northern origin and a date
before 1150.
Observations on the Epic Similes in *The Faerie Queene* (Zaidee E.
Green), pp. 217-28.
The Background of the Verb *Bask* (H. Whitehall), pp. 229-36.
Difficulties in the etymological and semantic development.
Jaques and the Malcontent Traveler (Z. S. Fink), pp. 237-52.
Two Debits for Tom Brown, with a Credit from Joseph Addison
(Benjamin Boyce), pp. 263-69.
Addison's Essay on the Tombs in Westminster Abbey.
The Castle of Perseverance, Line 695 (R. Withington), p. 270.
'pley' or 'prey'?

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 123

"I take my cap in my lappe . . ." (Norman E. Eliason), pp. 271-74.
Everyman, l. 801; *lappe* meaning hand?

"Three and fifty upon poor old Jack" (G. R. Stewart, Jr.), pp. 274-75.

1 *Henry IV.*, II. iv.; a reminiscence of the *Revenge*?

A Note on Nicholas Chaucer (C. R. Thompson), pp. 275-78.

Three further references, in a London *Letter-Book*, 1355, and in the *Close Rolls*, 1359 and 1360.

A New Document concerning Robert Chaucer (H. C. Whitford)
 pp. 278-82.

In *Rotuli Scotie*, l. 83 b.

The Pronoun of Address in *Troilus and Cressida* (C. C. Walcutt),
 pp. 282-87.

"A Middleton Forgery" (B. M. Wagner), pp. 287-88.

Authenticity of a note in the South Kensington copy of *A Game at Chesse*.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. L., September 1935—

The Date of the Flourishing of the "Wakefield Master" (Mendal G.
 Frampton), pp. 631-60.

1425-50.

Nathaniel Wood's *Conflict of Conscience* (Celesta Wine), pp. 661-78.

Thomas Deloney's Euphuistic Learning and *The Forest* (Hyder E.
 Rollins), pp. 679-86.

Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Play Manuscripts (Alfred
 Harbage), pp. 687-99.

Census of extant manuscripts, 1558-1700.

Exemplum Materials Underlying *Macbeth* (Beatrice Daw Brown),
 pp. 700-14.

Is Shakespeare's *Much Ado* a Revised Earlier Play? (Allison Gaw),
 pp. 715-38.

Evidence against alleged revision.

The Public Repudiation of Hero (Nadine Page), pp. 739-44.

2 and 3 *Henry VI*—Which Holinshed? (Lucille King), pp. 745-52.

Evidence that Shakespeare used the 1587 edition.

Middleton's Acquaintance with the *Merrie Conceited Jests of George
 Peele* (Mildred G. Christian), pp. 753-60.

The Contemporary Significance of Middleton's *Game at Chesse*
 (J. R. Moore), pp. 761-68.

Bishop Percy, Thomas Warton, and Chatterton's Rowley Poems
 (1773-1790) (A. Watkins-Jones), pp. 769-84.

Unpublished letters.

Notes on Keats's Reading (Douglas Bush), pp. 785-806.

Carlyle and the German Philosophy Problem during the Year 1826-27
 (Hill Shine), pp. 807-27.

The Three Daughters of Deorman (Hope Emily Allen), pp. 899-902.
The anchoresses of Kilburn.

Thomas Churchyard's Pension (Allan G. Chester), p. 902.
20d. a day for life granted in 1597.

Theophrastus and Hall: A Correction (Zaidee E. Green), pp. 902-03.
Misprint in article in *P.M.L.A.*, XVIII., pp. 412-23.

Spenser or Anthony Munday?—A Note on the *Axiochus* (Bernard Freyd), pp. 903-08.

Attempt to demonstrate Munday's authorship. Reply by F. M. Padelford, pp. 908-13.

Astery's Transformation in *Muioptomos* (C. W. Lemmi), pp. 913-14.
Lactantius's Commentary on Statius as source.

The Date of Spenser's *Mutabilitie Cantos* (J. M. Purcell), pp. 914-17.
Counting of words in a partial analysis of vocabulary unsatisfactory as evidence of date.

Una and Duessa (Roland M. Smith), pp. 917-19.
Occurrences of names in Ireland.

Henry VI and the *Contention Plays* (W. W. Greg), pp. 919-20.
Evidence from inconsistency in the repeated article of peace.

An Elizabethan Tournament (Sara R. Watson), pp. 920-22.
Fragment printed in *Kenilworth Illustrated*, 1821.

The Idea of Taste in the Eighteenth Century (R. W. Babcock), pp. 922-26.

The Rambler, No. 191 (Mallie J. Murphy), pp. 926-28.

Johnson on the Sanctity of an Author's Text (James M. Osborn), pp. 928-29.

Malone's report of a conversation with Johnson.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. XII., August 1935—

Robert Southwell and the Council of Trent (Ch. R. Mangam), pp. 481-92.

Sainte-Beuve et les poètes romantiques anglais (E. M. Phillips), pp. 493-507.

L'Intellectualisme d'Oscar Wilde (J. Charbonnier), pp. 508-19.

Brazil, as it is in Thomas Hardy's Novel (C. J. Weber), pp. 520-23.

— Vol. XIII., October—

Sur Ben Jonson (A. Brulé), pp. 1-17.

Don Armado as a Gallant (D. G. Boughner), pp. 18-28.

Edgar Poe et Macaulay (M. Le Breton), pp. 38-42.

The Tale of the Ragged Mountains.

SPECULUM, Vol. X., July 1935—

Vincent of Beauvais and Dame Pertelote's Knowledge of Medicine (Pauline Aiken), pp. 281-87.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 125

SPECULUM, October—

- Sir John Fortescue on the Education of Rulers (C. F. Arrowood), pp. 404-10.
In his treatise *De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXII., July 1935—

- The Elizabethan Dramatic Parasite (E. P. Vandiver, Jr.), pp. 411-27.
The "New Astronomy" and English Literary Imagination (Marjorie Nicolson), pp. 428-62.
Two Augustans cross the Alps: Dennis and Addison on Mountain Scenery (Clarence D. Thorpe), pp. 463-82.
Wordsworth's "Hermitage": Racedown or Grasmere? (David H. Bishop), pp. 483-507.
A Probable Paracelsian Element in Shelley (Elizabeth Ebeling), pp. 508-24.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, June 20, 1935—

- Chapman and Florio (H. R. L. Edwards), p. 399.
Reference in the dedication of Chapman's *Shadow of Night*.

— June 27—

- "Dicing Fly" and *The Alchemist* (Hope Emily Allen), p. 416.
Meaning of phrase and parallel uses of "fly." Further note, with correction, August 1, p. 489.
An Unknown Translator of Erasmus (F. Brompton Harvey), p. 416.
Translation of *The Colloquies* by "H. M., Gent," 1671.
Richard III on the Stage (James G. McManaway), p. 416.
Cast of production c. 1684-5. Note by M. Summers, July 4, p. 432.

— July 4—

- A Lost and Found Volume of Manuscript Plays (F. S. Boas), p. 432.
The Lambarde volume, now in the Folger Library. Note by B. M. Wagner, July 11, p. 448.
Collins's Ode on Colonel Ross (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 432.
Reference in *The Life and Memoirs of Mr. Ephraim Tristram Bates*, 1756.
A Riddle by Prior (J. R. Moore), p. 432.
Addison's interpretation in *The Whig-Examiner*.
Evidence (R. W. Chapman), p. 432.
Eighteenth-century use of the word in the meaning "clearness."
G. A. Lawrence's *Songs of Feast, Field and Fray* (W. Roberts), p. 436.
Note by M. Summers, July 11, p. 452; reply by W. Roberts, July 18, p. 464.

— July 11—

- An Essay by Collins (Frederick Page), p. 448.
"Of the Essential Excellencies in Poetry," in Dodsley's *Museum*. Notes by E. H. W. Meyerstein, July 25, p. 477; E. Blunden, August 8, p. 501.

The Plates in Settle's *The Empress of Morocco* (W. J. Lawrence), p. 448.

Nature of the plates and their unreliability as evidence of staging.

Lord Rochester (C. H. Wilkinson), p. 448.

Poems in *The Triumph of Wit*, 1688.

John Donne's Library (I. R. Maxwell), p. 448.

Addition to Dr. Keynes' list.

July 18—

The "Senseless Lure" Problem (J. G. Flynn), p. 464.

Note on *Tamburlaine*, Part I, III. iii, 158: a hawking term.

July 25, 1935—

Nook-shotten (Allen Mawer), p. 477.

Use in Warwickshire for a field with nine angles.

Articles by Mrs. Gaskell (Ross D. Waller), p. 477.

In *Sartain's Union Magazine*, July 1849 and February 1850.

August 1—

Ken Wood, Cane Wood (E. Jeffries Davis), p. 489.

The Canons' Wood? Replies by J. G. Muddiman, p. 501; by A. T. Bolton, August 15, p. 513; by J. G. Muddiman, August 22, p. 525; by E. J. Davis and E. Williams, August 29, p. 537; by J. N. Keynes and A. T. Bolton, September 5, p. 552.

Wanted—A Pocket Shakespeare (Peter Alexander), p. 489.

Principles of textual emendation.

From Kinglake to Lawrence (A. S. Bryant), p. 489.

Lawrence's debt to E. H. Palmer.

"Got" for "Yet" (R. W. Chapman), p. 489.

Misreadings of Johnson's handwriting.

August 15—

Ingram Frizer (F. B. Williams, Jr.), p. 513.

References in wills.

Great Expectations (T. E. M. Boll), p. 513.

Wisdom of the ending.

Richard Mulcaster (C. R. Baskervill), p. 513.

Pageants for the formal entry of Elizabeth in 1559.

Fatum Vortigerni (W. H. McCabe), p. 513.

Written by Thomas Carleton, acted at Douay 22 August, 1619.

August 22—

Hazlitt and Maga (T. Besterman), p. 525.

Letter from Blackwood to Cadell, April, 1823.

Browne's *Urne Buriall* (John Carter), p. 528.

Bibliographical note.

— August 29—

Rasselas and the *Persian Tales* (Geoffrey Tillotson), p. 534.

Samuel Richardson and *Sir William Harrington* (W. M. Sale, Jr.), p. 537.

Evidence of Miss Meades' authorship and Richardson's corrections.

Hamlet's Own Lines (E. H. C. Oliphant), p. 537.

Hamlet, III. ii.; reply by G. Sampson, September 5, p. 552; by Fitzroy Pyle, September 12, p. 565.

A Rhyme in Browning (W. L. Phelps), p. 537.

The Worst of It: "tired" in MS.

— September 5—

Pastoral Plays, pp. 541-42.

Keats and "Miss Mary F——" (H. W. Garrod), p. 552.

Woodhouse's cousin Miss Frogley. Further note by M. Buxton Forman, 19 September, p. 580.

Milton's Prelatical Pamphlets (G. W. Whiting), p. 552.

— September 12—

Peter Idley (E. St. John Brooks), p. 565.

The Drayton family and its relations with Idley.

Corrections to *The Short-Title Catalogue* (F. B. Williams, Jr.), p. 565.

Letters of Dorothy Wordsworth (Catherine M. Maclean), p. 565.

Early letters not included.

Englishmen in Rome, 1450-1510 (V. Flynn), p. 565.

Manuscript recording names and dates of visits. Further note by R. Weiss, September 26, p. 596.

— September 19—

The Original Staging of *Romeo and Juliet*, Act III., Scene v. (W. J. Lawrence), p. 580.

Scene on the Balcony. Reply by G. Sampson, November 9, p. 722.

The Dumb-Show in *Hamlet* (John Purves), p. 580.

Relation to the *azzi* of the *Commedia dell'arte*.

Prospective? (R. W. Chapman), p. 580.

Note on Jane Austen's letter of May 17, 1799.

— September 26—

Miss Smythies (Frank G. Black), p. 596.

Authoress of *The Brothers*, 1758, and other novels.

Lamb and Hazlitt (P. P. Howe), p. 596.

Interpretation of a passage in Crabb Robinson's *Diary*, 1811.

— October 3—

A Wordsworth Letter (Catherine M. Maclean), p. 612.

Date of Letter 180: 1804 or 1806?

Buckingham's Chemist (Paul B. Anderson), p. 612.

Dr. Peter Bellon.

- "Fortunio" and "Raymundus" (S. H. Atkins), p. 612.
 Identification of references in Hall's *Virgidemiae*, IV. iii. 28-37.
 The Press Club Newspaper Collection, p. 616.
 Bibliographical note.

October 10—

- Arnold's *Dover Beach* (C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry), p. 631.
 MS. draft of the first twenty-eight lines.
 The Date of *Othello* (Alfred Hart), p. 631.
 Echos in *Hamlet* Q 1? Note by A. S. Cairncross, October 24, p. 670.
 Browning and Donne (D. A. Smalley), p. 631.
 Edition used by Browning?
 Ralph Knevett's *Supplement of the Faery Queene* (C. B. Millican), p. 631.
 Publication Dates (F. Coykendall), p. 631.
 Title-page date or actual date for purposes of reference?

October 17—

- The Coverdale Bible (L. A. Sheppard), p. 652.
 Evidence that it was printed by Soter and Cervicornus, possibly at Marburg.
 Francis Quarles in Ireland (Gordon S. Haight), p. 652.
 Evidence of a letter in the Bodleian from Quarles to Ussher.
 Posh (T. D. Atkinson), p. 653.
 Suggested derivation.

October 24—

- "The Sere, the Yellow Leaf" (C. T. Onions), p. 671.
 "Sere" a noun, not an adjective.
 The Leicester Abbey Catalogue (Ramona Bressie), p. 671.
 Present location of manuscripts. Note by M. R. James, November 2, p. 697.
 A Scots Sermon-Squib (W. Fraser Mitchell), p. 676.
 "The Red-Shankes Sermon." Bibliographical note, and discussion of origin.

November 2—

- Contemporary Models of Sir Thomas More (H. Stanley Jevons), p. 692.
Utopia and the Socialist Inca Empire.
 An Unchronicled Shakespeare Edition (Davidson Cook), p. 697.
Popular Dramatic Works, 6 vols., published by Vernon, Hood and Sharpe, c. 1809.
 Rochester and Lee (Graham Greene), p. 697.
 Identification of character in Lee's *Princess of Cleve*. Reply by W. J. Lawrence, November 9, p. 722.
 "Pine End" (David Salmon and C. Wanklyn), p. 697.
 A borrowing from Welsh?
 Bowles and the Sonnet (Geoffrey Tillotson), p. 697.
 A contemporary reference.

670.

illican),

arburg.

ber 2,

ion of

vons),

7.
harpe,

W. J.